3 1761 07275119 1

Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by
Lady Falconer
from the books of the late
Sir Robert Falconer, K.C.M.G.,
President of the University of
Toronto, 1907-1932

THE

FOREIGN BIBLICAL LIBRARY.

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A.,

Editor of the "Expositor."

WEISS' MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

London:

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,

27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVIII.

W

A

MANUAL OF INTRODUCTION

TO THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

DR. BERNHARD WEISS,

Ober-Konsistorialrath and Professor of Theology.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY

A. J. K. DAVIDSON.

4268.26
H. 8. H4

IN TWO VOLUMES. VOL. II.

London:

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,

27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLXXXVIII.

(*All rights reserved.*)

Butler & Tanner,
The Selwood Printing Works,
Frome, and London.

TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. II.

APPENDIX. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

PAGE

§ 30. The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. . . 1

1. The Assumption of the Pauline Authorship of the Epistle.
2. Testimony of the Epistle Itself.
3. Style, and Relation to the Old Testament.
4. The Doctrinal View of the Epistle.
5. The Hypothesis of the Luke and Clement Authorship.
6. The Apollos Hypothesis.
7. The Composition of the Epistle by Barnabas.

§ 31. The Readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews . . 17

1. Epistolary Character of the Work.
2. Jewish-Christian Character of the Readers.
3. State of the Churches.
4. Hypotheses as to the Readers of the Epistle.
5, 6. Its Alleged Destination for Alexandria or Rome.
7. The Hebrews of the Epistle's Inscription.

§ 32. The Situation of the Hebrew Epistle with respect to Time 30

1. Time of Composition.
2. Situation in Time and History.
3–7. Analysis of the Epistle.

SECOND DIVISION. THE REVELATION OF JOHN.

§ 33. The Apostle John 45

1. Accounts of John's Life in Palestine.
2. John in Ephesus.
3. The Composition of the Apocalypse by the Apostle.

PAGE

4. The Tradition respecting the Abode of John in Asia Minor.
5. Traditions respecting the Patmos Exile and the End of John.

§ 34. The Composition of the Apocalypse 59

1. Nature of Apocalyptic Prophecy.
2. The Visions of the Apocalypse.
3. The Figurative Language of the Apocalypse.
4. The Arrangement of the Apocalypse.
5, 6. The Analysis of the Apocalypse.
7. Language of the Apocalypse.

§ 35. The Historical Situation of the Apocalypse . . . 77

1. Internal Condition of the Seven Churches.
2. External State with respect to the World.
3. Apocalyptic Combination of the Apostle.
4. The Last Fortunes of Jerusalem (date of the Apocalypse).
5. The Anti-Pauline Conception of the Apocalypse.
6. Doctrinal Views of the Apocalypse.

THIRD DIVISION. THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

§ 36. The Brethren of Jesus 89

1. The Brethren of Jesus in the New Testament.
2. Distinction between the Brethren of the Lord and the Apostles.
3. The Way in which the true Brethren of the Lord are explained away.
4. Change of the Brethren into Cousins of Jesus.
5. Identification of the Brother of the Lord with James the son of Alphæus.

§ 37. The Epistle of James 100

1. Readers of the Epistle.
2. The State of the Readers.
3. The Date of the Epistle.
4. Analysis of the Epistle.
5. Author of the Epistle.
6. The Older Criticism.
7. The Newer Criticism.

PAGE

§ 38. The Epistle of Jude 118

1. Analysis of the Epistle.
2. The Libertines of the Epistle.
3. Its Readers and the Time of its Composition.
4. The Author of the Epistle.
5. The Criticism of the Epistle.

§ 39. The Apostle Peter 128

1. Gospel Accounts of Peter.
2. Character of Peter.
3. Peter in the Acts.
4. Peter in Rome.
5. Martyrdom of Peter.

§ 40. The First Epistle of Peter 137

1. Readers of the Epistle.
2. State of the Readers (Relation of the Epistle to those of Paul).
3. Analysis of the Epistle.
4. Author of the Epistle and its Doctrinal View.
5. Situation of the Epistle.
6. The Current Conception of the Epistle.
7. The Later Criticism.

§ 41. The Second Epistle of Peter 154

1. The Readers of the Epistle and the Opposing Principles attacked.
2. Relation of the Epistle to that of Jude.
3. Analysis of the Epistle.
4. Doctrinal View and Language of the Epistle.
5. Date.
6. Criticism of the Epistle.
7. Concluding Result.

§ 42. The First Epistle of John 174

1. Its Epistolary Character.
2. The Errorists and the Object of the Epistle.
3. Analysis.
4. The Author of the Epistle and Peculiarity of his Doctrine.
5. Its Relation to the Gospel.

PAGE

6. Relation to the Apocalypse.
7. The Composition of the First Epistle and the Criticism to which it has been subjected.

§ 43. The Minor Epistles of John 197

1. The Author of the Epistles.
2. Contents of the Epistles.
3. Their Criticism.

FOURTH DIVISION. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

§ 44. The Synoptical Question 203

1. The Hypothesis of Mutual use.
2. The Primitive-gospel Hypothesis.
3. The Tradition Hypothesis.
4. The Mark Hypothesis.
5. The Tendency-criticism.
6. Return to Weisse. Revival Attempts.
7. The Hypothesis of a Primitive Mark.

§ 45. The Oldest Source 219

1. Pieces of the Oldest Source Preserved in Matthew and Luke alone.
2. Discourse-pieces of the Oldest Source in Mark.
3. Extent and arrangement of the Oldest Source.
4. Tradition respecting the Aramæan work of the Apostle Matthew.
5. The Gospel according to the Hebrews.
6. Date of the Hebrew Matthew.
7. The Oldest Apostolic writing and the Oral Type of Narrative.

§ 46. The Gospel of Mark 239

1. The Literary Character of the Gospel.
2. Griesbach's Hypothesis.
3. Doctrinal Character of the Gospel.
4. Mark's Gospel and the Oldest Source.
5. Analysis.
6. Tradition respecting Mark's Gospel.
7. The Origin of the Gospel.

PAGE

§ 47. The Gospel of Matthew 263

1. Dependence of the Gospel on Mark.
2. Dependence upon the Oldest Source.
3. Treatment of the two Sources in Matthew's Gospel.
4. Additions of the Evangelist, and his peculiarity.
5. Analysis of the Gospel.
6. Its Object.
7. Its Readers, Original Language, and Date.

§ 48. The Gospel of Luke 289

1. Dependence of the Gospel on Mark.
2. Dependence upon the Oldest Source (unacquaintedness with the First Gospel).
3. The Source peculiar to Luke.
4. Literary Character of Luke.
5. Analysis of the Gospel.
6. Doctrinal Character.
7. Tradition respecting the Author and the Date.

§ 49. The Acts of the Apostles 314

1–4. Analysis of the Acts.
5. Object of the Acts.
6. Doctrinal Character.
7. Credibility.

§ 50. The Sources of the Acts 332

1. The Use of Sources in the Acts.
2. Source of the First Part.
3. Source of the Second Part.
4. Hypothesis of the Use of a Travelling-Diary.
5. The Apparent Traces of such Use.
6. The Impossibility of Carrying out the Hypothesis.
7. Date of the Acts.

§ 51. The Gospel of John 355

1. Self-testimony of the Gospel.
2. Palestinian Character of the Gospel.
3. The Fourth Gospel and the Historical Figure of John.
4. Relation of the Gospel to the Synoptics.
5. Analysis.
6. Object of the Gospel.
7. Limitations of the Historicity of the Gospel.

PAGE

§ 52. The Johannine Question 386

1. The Tradition respecting John's Gospel.
2. The Older Criticism of the Gospel.
3. The Criticism of the Tübingen School.
4. Apologetics.
5. The Newest Phase of Criticism.
6. Mediating attempts.
7. Solution of the Johannine Question.

APPENDIX.

HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT.

I. The Preservation of the Text 403

1. The External Form of the Manuscripts.
2. The External Form of the Text.
3. The Divisions of the Text.
4. Corruptions of the Text.
5. Errors of Haste.
6. Emendations.
7. Citations of the Church Fathers.

II. Manuscripts 409

1. Number and Condition of the Manuscripts.
2. The Oldest MSS. of the Entire New Testament.
3. The MSS. of the Gospels.
4. The MSS. of the Paulines.
5. The MSS. of the Acts, the Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse.

III. Versions 412

1. The Syriac Versions.
2. The Egyptian Versions.
3. The Gothic and Armenian Versions.
4. The Old-Latin Version.
5. The Vulgate.

IV. The Printed Text and Text-Criticism 417

1. First Editions of the Greek Testament.
2. The Origin of the Receptus.
3. The Collectors of Various Readings. Joh. Jas. Wetstein.
4. Bengel and Griesbach.

PAGE

5. Lachmann and Tischendorf.
6. The Latest English Textual Critics.
7. Manual Editions.

V. The Philological Elaboration of the Text 423

1. Dispute between the Hebraists and the Purists.
2. New Testament Grammar.
3. New Testament Lexicography.
4. The Basis of New Testament Greek.
5. The Greek of the New Testament.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

§ 30. The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

1. Since the close of the Canon a fourteenth epistle, the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews, has been handed down as Pauline. But the West first adopted its Pauline authorship from the East, where this view gained currency solely on the authority of Origen (§ 12, 1, 2; § 11, 1). Yet Origen himself has no doubt whatever that the Epistle cannot possibly have proceeded from Paul on account of its language, but that another must have written down the *νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου* supplied to him. Only so far does he consider a Church justified in having it among the Paulines, which was the case here and there in his circle, though only in isolated instances, for, as he says, the *ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες* (viz. his teachers Pantaenus and Clement) would have handed it down *οὐκ εἰκῆ* as Pauline (inasmuch as it was at least indirectly Pauline even in his view). But by whom it is written God alone knows (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). Hence it is clear that the Pauline composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews was not a tradition of the Church even in Alexandria, but only an opinion of the schools that had been adopted by certain Churches in good faith. Origen so far adapted himself to this aspect of the question, that with certain reservations (comp. § 10, 6), he characterized and employed the Epistle as Pauline, though only in the above indirect sense. Whence Pantaenus and Clement, with whom the view that the Hebrew Epistle is Pauline originated, derived it, is by no means clear; we only know that even they try to

explain certain points that are apparently at variance with it (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 14); which certainly does not imply that they regarded its Pauline origin as an indisputable fact. Apart from the Alexandrian Church it is only in the Syrian Church Bible that we still find the Epistle ranked with the Paulines, which however by no means proves that it was directly counted as one of them (comp. § 10, 1). In all other parts of the Church it is either not recognised as Pauline or is expressly designated as un-Pauline. Thus the ecclesiastical reception of the Epistle among the Paulines is in fact entirely wanting in all historical foundation. In the Reformation period the old doubts respecting it were again raised by Cajetan and Erasmus; but the Council of Trent made haste to decree fourteen Pauline Epistles absolutely. The Reformers did not regard it as Pauline, and only a few Reformed Confessions have quoted it as such; it was not until after the middle of the 17th century that the traditional view again became prevalent in the Lutheran Church, while the opposition to it withdrew into Arminian and Socinian circles.[1] In the time of awakening criticism Semler and Michaelis still hesitated; but when Storr attempted to refute the rising doubts of the latter (1789), Ziegler came forward against him in his *Vollständige Einl. in den Brief an die Hebr.* (Gött. 1791). After that time Hug alone among critics

[1] Luther separates it entirely from the Pauline Epistles, and even from the "real, certain leading books" of Scripture (§ 12, 6); Melanchthon invariably treats it as an anonymous writing, and only in the Latin edition of the *Form. Conc.* is the author twice designated as Apostolus. Calvin and Beza expressly characterize it as non-Pauline, and the *Confessio Gallicana* still clearly separates it from the 13 Paulines, while the *Confessio Belgica* counts 14 Paulines, and the *Helvetica* and *Bohemica* cite it as Pauline. The Magdeburg centuriators, Balduin and Hunnius, distinctly contest its Pauline origin, while Flacius Illyricus, in his *Clavis* (1557), and Joh. Brenz the Younger, in his Commentary (1571), defend it. Since Joh. Gerhard and Abr. Calovius however, the view of its Pauline authorship has again become prevalent; Luther's view being defended only in isolated cases, as by Heumann and Lorenz Müller (1711, 1717).

still ventured to defend its Pauline authorship (in his Introduction), though with reservations in the later editions (comp. also Hofstede de Groot, *Disput. qua ep. ad Hebr. e Paull. epp. comp.* Traj. ad Rhen. 1826); and since Bleek (*Der Brief an die Hebr.*, Berlin, 1828) the view of its Pauline composition may from a scientific standpoint be regarded as set aside.[2]

2. The Epistle to the Hebrews does not by the slightest hint make any claim to have been written by Paul. It does not, like all the other epistles, begin with an address in which the author gives his name with a description of himself.[1] The writer does not call himself an apostle, nor does he anywhere pretend to apostolic authority; he speaks to his readers not from an official or authoritative position, but only exhorts them in a brotherly way (xiii. 22). While Paul lays much emphasis on the fact that he had not received his gospel from man, and traces all certainty respecting it to the revelation he had received and to the Holy Ghost, the author of this Epistle includes himself among those to whom the salvation proclaimed by the Lord Himself ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκου-

[2] It has indeed been again defended by Gelpke (*Vindiciæ orig. Plin. ad. Hebr. epist.*, Lugd. Bat. 1832), as also in the commentaries of Paulus and Stein (1833–34); but in recent times Hofmann is the only scholar of repute who has ventured to uphold it (comp. also Biesenthal, and Holtzheuer in his Commentary, 1883). Even the most resolute defenders of tradition, as Guericke, Ebrard, Thiersch, and Delitzsch, and the greater number of Catholic expositors, have ventured to adhere only to an indirect Pauline origin.

[1] Even Pantaenus and other Fathers were only able to account for the Gentile Apostle not calling himself ἀπόστολος in an Epistle to the Hebrews, on the ground that the Lord Himself had been their Apostle (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 14), a fact which however, by no means interfered with a mention of his name and of the readers in the address (comp. Phil. i. 1; Philem. 1). If according to Clement of Alexandria (*ibid.*) Paul did not wish by mentioning his name to repel the Hebrews, who entertained mistrust and suspicion of him, yet the Epistle must have been conveyed by somebody who gave the name of the writer. But the Roman and Colossian Epistles show that the fact of writing to a Church he had not founded does not, as Hofmann supposes, account for the omission o the address.

σάντων ἐβεβαιώθη, thus professing himself a disciple of the primitive apostles in a passage where he had every inducement to lay stress on the special confirmation his preaching of salvation had received, since he himself makes mention of the signs and wonders by which it is attested (ii. 3 f.). Euthalius already perceived this difficulty, without being able to solve it; we learn from him on the contrary how weak were the points of attachment supposed to have been discovered in the Epistle for its Pauline authorship. From x. 34, where the reading is unquestionably τοῖς δεσμίοις and not τοῖς δέσμοις μου, taken in connection with xiii. 19 it was assumed that the Apostle was in captivity, although the way in which he arranges his coming in xiii. 23 clearly enough proves the contrary; and from the greeting of the Italian Christians (xiii. 24) the conclusion was drawn that it was the well-known Roman captivity of the Apostle, although the expression οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, while not making this linguistically impossible, makes it at least very improbable. It was the mention of Timothy (xiii. 23) in particular that always led to the thought of Paul as the author, although we know nothing of a captivity of Timothy during the Apostle's lifetime; and although he does not appear here as the disciple dependent on Paul, but as a Christian brother who arranges his coming quite independently.[2]

3. The whole economy of the Epistle is entirely different from that of the Paulines. The absence of a thanksgiving introduction may be connected with the want of an address;

[2] It was therefore an entire mistake on the part of Schwegler, Zeller, and others to assume that the dates at the close of the Epistle belong to that outward form and literary fiction by which the author tried to personate the Apostle Paul, since he would certainly in that case have invented a corresponding address. Overbeck maintained still more arbitrarily (*Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, 1. Chemnitz, 1880) that the conclusion xiii. 22–25 was added, and the address originally containing another name cut off when the Canon was formed, in order to include the Epistle in it as Pauline. Compare on the other hand v. Soden, *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.*, 1884, 3, 4.

but the way in which the doctrinal and hortatory portions of the Epistle, instead of being separated from one another, are interwoven, manifestly with design, is quite at variance with the Pauline method. Even Origen has remarked that the style of the Hebrew Epistle *οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα*, as every one who understands differences of style may perceive (ap. Euseb., *H.E.*, 6, 25). As a matter of fact, no New Testament writing is so free from Hebraisms or written in such good Greek. While Paul struggles with his language, the discourse here flows smoothly on; and even copious and extended periods, on which Paul almost invariably founders, are finished with nice proportion and the most perfect regularity (i. 1–4; ii. 2–4; vii. 20–22; xii. 18–24). Great pains have evidently been bestowed on rhythmic harmony and effective phraseology; full sounding combinations (such as *μισθαποδοσία, ὁρκωμοσία, αἱματεκχυσία*), sonorous adjectives, and every kind of circumlocution give an oratorical fulness to the expression that contrasts as strongly with the meagre dialectics of the Apostle as with his wealth of words, which, though pregnant with thought, have no regularity of form. On the other hand, importance was erroneously attached in this instance also to the lexical peculiarities of the Epistle, in opposition to which it was easy to show a not immaterial agreement with the Pauline Epistles in stock of words. At most, the evident preference for the use of *ὅθεν*, of *ὑπέρ* and *παρά* with the comparative, of *ὅσος-τοσοῦτος* in comparisons, for verbs in *-ίζειν* and substantives in *-σις*, has something characteristic; and it is certainly significant that the Pauline *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς* never appears.[1]

[1] It could only have occurred to Hofmann to explain this diversity of style on the hypothesis that Paul was anxious to give to the Jews of Antioch with their Greek culture the best that the greatest attention to language would enable him to produce, and that while waiting for

Clement of Alexandria already took it for granted that Paul must have written to the Hebrews in Hebrew, for which reason he ascribed our Greek translation to Luke on account of the similarity of language with the Acts. This hypothesis became through Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 38) and Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.*, 5) the prevailing one with the Church Fathers; and after Joseph Hallet (1727), was again defended by Michaelis, and recently by Biesenthal (*Das Trostschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Hebr.* Leipz., 1878), who even ventured on a re-translation into Hebrew. It rests on the idea, refuted long ago, that Greek was not understood in Palestine (comp. to the contrary Acts xxii. 2), and is shattered by the pure and beautiful Greek of the Epistle, by its periodic structure which is entirely foreign to the spirit of the Semitic language, by its predilection for compounds for which no adequate expression is conceivable in Hebrew (comp. *e.g.* i. 1, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως; v. 2, μετριοπαθεῖν; v. 11, δυσερμήνευτος; xii. 1, εὐπερίστατος), and for paronomasias that could only have originated or been reproduced by chance (*e.g.* v. 8, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' οὗ ἔπαθεν; v. 14, καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ; viii. 7 f., ἄμεμπτος-μεμφόμενος; xiii. 14, μένουσαν-μέλλουσαν), which may also be said of the play on the double meaning of διαθήκη (ix. 15 ff.). But the prevailing use of the LXX. is decisive for a Greek original of the Epistle.[2]

Paul too quotes chiefly from the LXX., but never where it departs entirely from the sense of the primitive text, of which he betrays a knowledge in other respects; while the author of the Hebrew Epistle is evidently unacquainted with it. Moreover the latter in his quotations from the Septuagint seems to follow the form of the text in our *Cod. Alexandr.* almost exclusively, while Paul's rather follow the Vatican. While the citations of Paul are in most cases introduced

Timothy he had more quietness for writing the Epistle. As if he had not, according to Rom. i. 14, ff., far greater need of such care where the Romans were concerned, and also more leisure during his winter abode in Hellas!

[2] The Old Testament citations might indeed, even in a translation, have been given in accordance with the Greek version familiar to the readers, but not mere allusions to Old Testament passages, as in this case. Moreover citations occur, that only in the LXX. version were adapted to the author's mode of proof (i. 7; x. 37; xii. 5 f.; xv. 26), or that appear only in the LXX. and not at all in the primitive text (i. 6; xii. 21), a thing which already struck Jerome (*ad Jesaj.*, vi. 9); there is even one citation in which the whole reasoning is based on a manifest error in the LXX. (x. 5, 10).

simply as the words of Scripture, sometimes even with the name of the author, to which Heb. ii. 6 alone bears a certain analogy, the citations regularly appear here as the words of God (or as in iii. 7; x. 15 as words of the Holy Spirit), even where God Himself by no means speaks; a thing we sometimes find in Paul also, but where God is spoken of in the third person (i. 6 ff.; iv. 4, 7; vii. 21; x. 30). Whereas Paul undoubtedly quotes from memory and therefore with great freedom, our author cites long passages so literally that he must of necessity have consulted the originals. In addition to this we have the fact that the latter often uses them word for word (ii. 6–9; iii. 7–iv. 10; vii. 1–25); that he not only ponders on what the Scripture says, but also infers what it does not say (vii. 3); and that he sometimes justifies his departure from the historical sense after the manner of a theologian (iv. 6–9; xi. 13–16), which Paul never does. For all these reasons our Epistle cannot proceed from Paul.

4. The traditional conception of the Epistle influenced after-thought at least so far that the next view adopted was that the Epistle, if it did not proceed from Paul, was at all events the work of a Pauline disciple. Its polemic against Judaism, which had probably led the Alexandrians already to regard it as Pauline, seemed at least to point to the Pauline school; but it was overlooked that the object of attack as also the whole method, differed entirely from that of Paul. It contains nothing peculiarly Pauline in doctrine or range of thought, and where it does touch upon these the differences appear the more striking; the Christology alone, with its peculiar stamp, shows a process of development that is at least analogous.[1] Little was gained for the

[1] Holtzmann's endeavours to prove the use of Pauline Epistles (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, 1) have been quite in vain. It is just where the thought is kindred that the alleged parallels show how very differently it is conceived and carried out, while the correspondences of

characterization of either by saying that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews shows Alexandrian culture, while Paul betrays Palestinian and Rabbinical learning. The whole treatment of Scripture certainly recalls Philo, in whom we find similar forms of quotation, as for example ii. 6; iv. 4; the same use of Old Testament passages and narratives, as iii. 5; vi. 13 f.; vii. 1; the same conceptions of Old Testament usage, as in vii. 27; and even a citation that agrees word for word with xiii. 5. True allegory such as undoubtedly appears in Paul (Gal. iv. 2; 2 Cor. iii. comp. 1 Cor. ix. 9 f.), is not indeed found in the Hebrew Epistle; but on the other hand we have a far-reaching typology in the symbolism attached to the person of Melchisedek and to forms of worship (comp. de Wette, *die Symb.-typische Lehrart*, etc. in Schleiermacher's *Theol. Zeitschrift.*, 1822, 3), which in many respects recalls the way in which the Alexandrian theology depreciated outward ceremonies while seeking their true significance in their symbolical character (comp. *e.g.* x. 4; xiii. 15 and expressions such as σκία, παράδειγμα). In the same way we are reminded of our Epistle by certain statements of Philo, such as that respecting the sinlessness of the Logos-priest, respecting the heavenly home of the patriarchs, and the λόγος τομεύς (comp. iv. 12); but their whole meaning is entirely at variance with the

words are entirely without importance. The ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης in xiii. 20 is the phrase to which most significance might be attached; but surely the exhortations to intercession (xiii. 18), to εἰρήνην διώκειν (xii. 14), to φιλαδελφία and φιλοξενία will not seriously be adduced as specifically Pauline. The στοιχεῖα and the λόγια θεοῦ (v. 12) are quite a different thing from the parallel expressions in Paul, the ἅπαξ is in ix. 26 used of the death of Christ in quite a different sense from Rom. vi. 10; βρῶμα does not stand in opposition to milk as in Paul, but στερεὰ τροφή. The rest are all vocables and images, such as καύχημα and πληροφορία, τέλειος and ἐνεργής, καταργεῖν and τρέχειν, that can prove nothing. It cannot therefore in any sense be said that the citation x. 30, which is certainly unique, is taken from Rom. xii. 19, in whatever way the remarkable agreement be explained.

Epistle, while even the question as to whether a knowledge of Philo's writings can be proved is still a matter of controversy.[2] On the other hand Riehm (*Die Lehrbegr. des Hebräerbriefs*. Ludwigsburg, 1858, 1867) has convincingly shown that the author's conception of the two ages of the world, of the mediation of the law by angels, of Satan as having power over death, of angels, of the Sabbath rest of the people of God, of the heavenly sanctuary and the heavenly Jerusalem, are of Palestinian origin; for which reason it has been quite a mistake to put into the latter Philo's metaphysical distinction between the invisible, imperishable, ideal world and the visible, perishable world of phenomena. Even the Christology of the Epistle has no affinity whatever with the Logos doctrine of Philo, since the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης finds its most significant parallel in Wisdom vii. 25 f. and in the Targ. on Isaiah vi. 1. In any case the author has preserved his connection with the Old Testament more faithfully than with Alexandrinism, to the influence of whose Hellenic philosophy, notwithstanding its power, he has remained inaccessible. The Alexandrian culture of the author has exercised most influence on the formal side of his teaching, and probably has its origin exclusively in the time before he was a Christian. Since therefore he cannot be a Pauline disciple, he can only belong to the primitive apostolic circle, and in ii. 3 he expressly avows himself a disciple of the primitive Apostles. Only from this point of

[2] While Bleek, following Clericus and Mangey, considered this very probable; and Schwegler, Köstlin and Delitzsch maintained that it was so, it has been contested by Tholuck, Riehm and Wieseler. After all, the Epistle contains only isolated expressions that sound like an echo of Philo, *e.g.* δεήσεις καὶ ἱκετηρίαι, αἴτιος σωτηρίας, ἀμήτωρ, προσαγορευθείς, μετριοπαθεῖν, ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν; even the passage x. 29, comp. *de Profug.*, p. 462 D., has only a formal and limited resemblance. Of late Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Immer, Holtzmann and v. Soden in particular have regarded the peculiarity of the Epistle as consisting in its Alexandrinism in which it goes beyond Paul.

view can the peculiar teaching of our Epistle be adequately explained.[1]

The fundamental thought of the Epistle is the founding of the New Covenant, which is destined finally to realize the fulfilment of the Old Covenant promise that was not possible under the Old Covenant; a thought scarcely touched upon in any of the Pauline Epistles. Hence the object of the attainment of salvation is discussed with exclusive reference to the nation of Israel, not because the author has any wish to shut the Gentiles out from it, but because he is solely concerned with the question as to how the original recipients of the promise should attain to its fulfilment. This would in truth have been impossible to the Gentile Apostle. The fact that salvation could not be attained under the Old Covenant, did not, as with Paul, lie in the carnal nature of man, but in the fleshly character of the law. The thought is not here fixed on the law as a divinely given ordinance of life, as with Paul, but on the legal expiatory institution, which could only atone for sins of infirmity; whereas Paul never contemplated this side of the law or this distinction of sins. But if the law is not designed to bring about the attainment of salvation, it is intended to prepare the way for it, though not, as with Paul, by awakening the consciousness of sin and exciting a desire for the attainment of salvation, but by the typical prefiguration of the perfect atonement promised for the Messianic time; a thought that was first taken up by Paul in the Captivity Epistles and manifestly adopted from the primitive apostolic sphere of thought. For the purpose of establishing this, the υἱός already foretold in the Old Testament, now appears upon the earth, which name here denotes a being eternally co-equal with God, taking a more independent part than with Paul in the creation and preservation of the world,

[1] David Schulz in his Commentary (1818) had already declared the fundamental conception of our Epistle to be essentially distinct from that of Paul and still Jewish throughout, while Plank (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1847, 2–4) interpreted it as the counterpart of Paulinism from the Jewish Christian standpoint. Baur and Schwegler on the other hand sought to prove that it was an attempt at reconciling Paulinism with Judaism, while Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, 54) first recognised it to be a remodelling of Jewish Christianity due to the influence of Paul; Ritschl and Riehm regarding it as a later development of the primitive apostolic doctrine, comp. Weiss, *Lehrb. d. Bibl. Theol.*, 4 Aufl. 1884, iv. 4; Kluge, *der Hebräerbrief*. Neu-Ruppin, 1863, as also Mangold. The objections recently made by v. Soden to the only interpretation of ii. 3 consistent with the wording, for the purpose of combating this view, are quite unimportant, for it remains unshaken, even if the passage allows intermediate members between the primitive Apostles and the author.

and of whose relation to God a clear idea is sought to be given by the help of the wisdom-doctrine of Alexandria. He is the mediator of the new covenant, however, since He assumes flesh and blood, in order by this means to become the sinless High Priest, liable to temptation, but made perfect in obedience, the living image of whose humanity, handed down by eye-witnesses, stands in vivid colouring before the author's mind, quite otherwise than with the Apostle Paul. After having in His death made perfect atonement, which is compared sometimes with the sacrifice of the covenant, sometimes with the sacrifice offered up by the high priest on the great day of atonement, He enters into the heavenly holy of holies, there continually to give efficacy to the atonement He had procured, and by His permanent office of High Priest to afford seasonable help to believers in their temptations; while the resurrection and kingly rule of Christ, so strongly emphasized by Paul, are almost entirely left out of sight. The effect of this sacrifice, the need of which is exemplified in the Hebrew Epistle by a chain of reasoning quite different from that of Paul (comp. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.*, § 122), is purification by sprinkling with the blood of the covenant, sanctification (in the theocratic sense) and perfection (τελείωσις) which amounts in substance to what Paul in his reasoning calls δικαίωσις—a reasoning that on account of its different starting-point necessarily assumes an entirely different form. By this means it is made possible for man to draw nigh to God and to have full participation in the covenant; thus the new covenant is founded, and with it the Messianic time, the αἰὼν μέλλων (which to the Apostle is still entirely future), is already entered upon. Grace is not, as with Paul, the principle of salvation but the favour of God restored in this covenant to those included in it; their sonship, though seeming to have some affinity with the Pauline adoption, is yet in quite a distinctive way regarded as the claim to the birthright; the Spirit is not the new life-principle but the principle solely of gifts of grace. Of election as distinguished from calling there is no mention; the members of the Old Covenant are called to the salvation of the New Covenant, but on condition of holding fast hope in the fulfilment of the covenant-promise. Whoever neglects to fulfil this covenant-obligation, or ceases to fulfil it, commits the deadly sin for which the Old Covenant had no atoning sacrifice and for which there is no propitiation under the New Covenant. Faith is the condition of this fulfilment, and is therefore partly confidence in the fulfilment of the Divine promise, and partly a firm belief in the invisible institutions of salvation which have made it possible. This faith, which already under the Old Covenant formed the distinguishing mark of the pious, is the main constituent in the righteousness required by God, for which reason the Pauline antithesis of faith and works is naturally wanting. Righteousness is attained not by community of life with Christ, by regeneration or sancti-

fication through the Spirit as with Paul, but by the law written in the heart, by mutual exhortation and by the fatherly training of God. Even in the eschatology of the Epistle, the resurrection and the new corporeality that form the centre with Paul, retire completely into the background; the foreground being occupied with the transformation of the world, the heavenly Jerusalem and the eternal Sabbath-rest to be expected there, while the wrath of God, who appears exclusively as the Judge of the world, destroys all His enemies. That these thoughts, so harmoniously combined, are not drawn from the teaching of Paul, still less from the Alexandrian philosophy of religion, but are allied to the Old Testament and the primitive Apostolic teaching, is so obvious, that v. Soden's attempted denial, based only on matters of detail (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1884, 4) must necessarily fail.

5. Origen (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25) already names Luke and Clement (of Rome) as the two disciples, to one of whom ἡ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ascribed the immediate composition of the Hebrew Epistle. An indirect Pauline origin had therefore been thought of even before him. His teacher Clement it is true only regarded Luke as the translator of the Hebrew original (No. 3), but a translation of this kind was certainly at that time regarded more in the light of a free composition; for Eusebius, who according to *H. E.*, 3, 38 supposes Clement to be the translator, adduces not only the style but also the similarity of thought in the first Epistle of Clement in proof of this hypothesis. Philastrius (*Hær.*, 89) and Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.*, 5) also show an acquaintance with the hypothesis of composition by Luke or Clement, only that the latter speaks at the same time of the Eusebian translation-hypothesis. The Luke-hypothesis was accepted by Grotius and Crell, and recently by Delitzsch (*Zeitschr. für luth. Theol. U.K.*, 1849, 2 and his Commentary, 1857). Ebrard (*Komm.*, 1850) and Döllinger (*Christ. u. Kirche.* Regensb. 1860) have adopted the view of a more or less independent authorship of the Epistle on the part of Luke. The main argument since the time of Clement has been the alleged affinity of language between the Hebrew Epistle and the writings of Luke (comp. Weizsäcker, *Jahrb. f. deutsch. Theol.*,

1862, 3), which has certainly been much over-estimated.[1] Moreover Luke shows no sign of the gift of oratory possessed by the author of the Hebrew Epistle, nor of Alexandrian culture; in so far as any peculiarity of doctrine is to be found in Luke, it is only a faded Paulinism, and it is solely where he draws from primitive apostolic sources, that we find points of contact with the Hebrew Epistle. Besides, Luke was a Gentile Christian, a fact it is vain to try and dispute in face of Col. iv. 11, 14 (comp. § 48, 7), while the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is rooted in Judaism; and although Luke naturally collected material for his Gospel in primitive apostolic circles (Luke i. 2), he is undoubtedly a true Pauline disciple, for which reason he cannot be taken into account. The same thing applies to the Roman Clement to whom Erasmus sought to attribute the composition of the Hebrew Epistle. Catholic theologians, such as Reithmayr and Bisping (in his Commentary, 1854) have gladly adopted this view and endeavoured to reconcile it in some way with tradition; but the reminiscences of the Hebrew Epistle contained in the first Epistle of Clement (§ 6, 3), by which Eusebius was already led astray, form the most convincing argument against this hypothesis, since we manifestly have here a partial imitation. That the Epistle of Clement is entirely wanting in the oratorical sweep and peculiar doctrinal view of the Hebrew Epistle, needs no proof. Mark and Aquila have also

[1] The reason of this affinity, in so far as it actually exists, lies simply in the fact that Luke too, like the author of the Hebrew Epistle, writes a pure and more periodic Greek when he is not dependent on his sources; beyond this there is only a very narrow circle of expressions occurring somewhat more frequently in both, but only to some extent exclusively (ἀρχηγός, ἡγούμενοι, εὐλαβεία, with deriv. χειροποιητός, μαρτυρεῖσθαι, χρηματίζειν, κατανοεῖν, ἐμφανίζειν, μεταλαμβάνειν, τὰ πρὸς with Acc.). All other expressions that have been adduced in favour of this view either appear too rarely in one of the two authors or too frequently elsewhere in the New Testament to be able to prove anything.

been named; but there is no reason for dwelling on this point.

6. Luther named *Apollos* as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though not, as it appears, without predecessors; and while Lucas Osiander and Joh. Clericus assented to this hypothesis, Heumann and Lor. Müller defended it against the traditional view that had again become predominant. But it was through Ziegler's instrumentality in the first place, and more particularly by Bleek's brilliant defence of the hypothesis, that it became for a long time the prevailing one. It has been adopted more or less decidedly by Credner, Guericke, Reuss, Feilmoser, Lutterbeck, Hilgenfeld; and again recently by L. Schulze, as well as by most commentators (Tholuck, Alford, Lünemann, Kurtz). Apollos, according to Acts xviii. 24, was an Alexandrian Jew learned in the Scripture and eloquent in discourse, which is confirmed by the Corinthian Epistle: he was not a Pauline disciple properly speaking, but worked independently with and beside Paul, and, as it appears, by preference among the Jews (xviii. 28). Just as little was he a disciple of the primitive Apostles (Heb. ii. 3), nor do we know that he had any connection whatever with primitive apostolic circles. No one in ecclesiastical antiquity, not even the Roman Clement who was acquainted with him as well as with the Hebrew Epistle, brought him into connection with it; this view therefore remains a pure hypothesis, whose scientific value has nevertheless been much over-estimated. The most striking proof of this is the Silas-hypothesis directed against it. The latter it is true has only been supported by v. Mynster (after 1808, lastly in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829, 2) and Böhme in his Commentary (1825); but Riehm has convincingly shown that if once the field of pure hypothesis be resorted to, quite as much may be said in favour of this as of the Apollos-hypothesis. As a native Jew, a prominent member of the primitive Church (Acts xv. 22), as a com-

panion of Paul and Timothy for many years, and yet having relations with Peter (1 Pet. v. 12), as a man of prophetic gifts (Acts xv. 32) Silas is just as well fitted as Apollos, in many respects decidedly better fitted than he, to be the author of the Hebrew Epistle; and the fact that we make his acquaintance in Jerusalem by no means precludes his having been a Hellenist of Alexandrian culture. But here too we fail to get beyond abstract possibilities.

7. Antiquity supplies an actual tradition respecting the author of the Hebrew Epistle, viz. a North African one. Tertullian is not of the opinion that it proceeds from *Barnabas*, but he knows nothing to the contrary; and however willing to invest it with apostolic authority, he is bound by tradition (§ 9, 4), which the Stichometry in the *Cod. Clarem.* (§ 11, 1) also impartially follows.[1] We now know that Joseph surnamed Barnabas, was a Levite of Cyprus (Acts iv. 36), where, owing to the close connection in which the island stood with Alexandria, he might easily enough have acquired the degree of Alexandrian culture which we find in the author of our Epistle (No. 4). The way in which the ordinance of worship forms the centre of his view of the law, is in keeping with his Levitical origin. Since he appears so early as a prominent member of the primitive Church, he must certainly have been a disciple of the primitive Apostles; the Acts call him a *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*, he could therefore have probably composed a *λόγος παρακλήσεως* such as the Epistle to the Hebrews professes to be (xiii. 22).

[1] The way in which Wieseler (*Chronologie*, 1848, *Untersuchungen über den Hebräerbrief.* Kiel, 1861. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1847, 4; 1867, 4) has endeavoured to find this tradition everywhere, even in the Syrian-Palestinian Church, is certainly carried to too great an excess; but the West would scarcely have been so obstinate in excluding the Hebrew Epistle from the Canon, unless not only had nothing of its Pauline origin been there known, but had it not also been positively known to have a different origin; for even Philastrius and Jerome were well acquainted with this view though the latter cites Tertullian alone in its favour.

For years he worked with Paul in Antioch and on the first missionary journey without giving up his independence to him (comp. Acts xv. 39). How far he turned to the Gentile mission after separating from Paul we have not the least knowledge; in any case this circumstance did not prevent his turning to the Church to which he had belonged so long, with a word of earnest exhortation. The so-called Barnabas-epistle can in no case proceed from him, on account of its entirely anti-Jewish standpoint; but the fact that this weak imitation of the Hebrew Epistle, issuing in allegorizing subtleties was in Alexandria ascribed to him after the Hebrew Epistle had been made a Pauline production, probably rests on misapprehended reminiscences of the original circumstances of the case.[2] One of the few Reformers who emancipated himself from the tradition of the Church, the Scotchman Cameron, declared himself in favour of Barnabas so early as the beginning of the 17th century; he was pronounced the author of our Epistle by Schmidt in his Introduction (1804), Twesten in his Dogm. (1826), and Ullmann (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1828, 2). This view has been supported not only by Wieseler, but also by Thiersch (*de Ep. ad Hebr. Comm.* Marb. 1848), Adolf Maier in his Commentary (1861), Ritschl (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, 1) and by Grau. Other voices have been recently raised in its favour by H. Schultz, de Lagarde, Renan, Zahn (*R. Encycl.* V. 1879), Volkmar,

[2] The principal objection constantly urged against the Hebrew Epistle having originated with him, viz. that the inexact knowledge shown in ix. 1 ff.; vii. 27 of the temple at Jerusalem and its services cannot be attributed to a Levite who had lived there for so long, rests on a simple misunderstanding. It is now more and more widely acknowledged (comp. Zahn, Keil) and has been emphatically asserted by v. Soden, that the Hebrew Epistle does not speak of the temple at Jerusalem and its services at all, but of the tabernacle and the legal worship as presented in the typically prophetic Scripture of the Old Testament. Whether it has always rightly apprehended what is there said, is as much a matter of indifference as whether the existing arrangements and ordinances in the Jerusalem temple harmonized with its conception.

Overbeck and Keil (*Komm.*, 1885); and unless with Eichhorn, Köstlin, Ewald, Grimm, Hausrath, v. Soden and others, we refuse to name any one as the author, this view is certainly the only one that has every probability in its favour.

§ 31. The Readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

1. Although the Epistle to the Hebrew begins without the usual epistolary introduction and characterizes itself as a λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (xiii. 22), yet this very passage shows that the document confesses itself a letter (διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν), besides which, it closes with epistolary greetings (xiii. 24). Even before the solemn benediction (xiii. 20 f.) the purely epistolary relation of the author to his readers appears, since he requests their intercession that he may be restored to them the sooner (xiii. 18 f.).[1] Thus the conception that the document only presupposes an ideal public, perhaps mainly Jewish Christians, a view adopted by Schwegler, following Euthalius, Lightfoot and older commentators (comp. Baumgarten and Heinrichs), and to which even Guericke inclines, falls to the ground. The circumstances of the readers, as presupposed by the author, are entirely concrete (v. 11 f.; xii. 5, 12), he speaks of their conduct and welfare in the past (vi. 10; x. 32 ff.; xii. 4), and it can only be a definite Church circle that he hopes to

[1] Bergen (*Gött. Theol. Bibl.*, III. 3) already regarded the so-called Epistle to the Hebrews as a homily, to which an epistolary conclusion was only appended on its transmission (xiii. 22–25), Reuss regarded it as a theological treatise, Ebrard (*Komm.*, 1850), as a guide for Neophytes, Hofmann as a written discourse which takes the form of a letter only at the end. According to Kurtz (*Komm.*, 1869) the original epistolary introduction, which expressed severe censure on the recipients, was cut away from the copies intended for others; according to Overbeck this happened at the formation of the Canon (comp. § 30, 2, note 2); while according to v. Soden the want of the alleged original introduction to the Epistle can no longer be accounted for.

see again (xiii. 23). It does not indeed necessarily follow that a single Church is in question, as Köstlin maintains; for however probable it may be that the Epistle was intended in the first place for a single Church, this does not shut out the possibility of its having been destined at the same time for a larger circle of Churches, each of which had its own rulers (xiii. 7, 17, 24) and its assemblings for Divine worship (x. 25). On the other hand it is quite inconceivable that the Epistle was intended only for a small circle within a community, since even the ἀδελφοί addressed have those ἡγούμενοι and ἐπισυναγωγαί *in common*, and therefore constitute one or more Church organisms, being responsible as such to one another (iii. 12 f.; x. 24 f.; xii. 13, 15).[2] From the form of the greeting (xiii. 24) it only follows that the Epistle was not transmitted to the authorities of the Church as such, but to individual overseers more closely connected with the author, who were to give to all the rest the greeting it contained as also to the entire Church before whom the whole Epistle was to be read publicly (comp. 1 Thess. v. 26; Phil. iv. 21).

2. The Church or Church-circle to which our Epistle is addressed, is unquestionably Jewish-Christian. Of the salvation destined for the people of God (iv. 9; comp. x. 30) or

[2] David Schulz entertained the very fanciful idea of a private association of mystic Christians outside Palestine, who like the Essenes and Therapeutae, attached importance to all kinds of abstinence, Ebrard thought of a closed circle of neophytes, while Wieseler and Hilgenfeld, like Kurtz and Zahn, in accordance with their erroneous views respecting the address of the Epistle, thought of the Jewish-Christian portion of a mixed Church, which is also inconceivable on other grounds (comp. No. 2). According to Holtzmann (*Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1883, 1) the Epistle was first to find out for itself within a large Church the circle to whom it was intelligible and for whom therefore it was designed; which is excluded by xiii. 24, as also by the fact that the ἡγούμενοι and the ἐπισυναγωγαί of whom mention is made in the Epistle, cannot in the nature of things belong to a circle of this kind but only to a whole Church.

for the people absolutely (ii. 17; xiii. 12) it is assumed throughout that the readers either do or will participate in it; those addressed in ix. 14, unless we give up all the connection, can only be the called who are to be redeemed from the transgressions committed ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ, *i.e.* members of the old covenant; they are characterized as σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ in the true sense (ii. 11, 16), while their fathers are called the Fathers absolutely (i. 1). The meats to which, according to 13, 9 ff., they attach importance can only be sacrificial meats; and the ἐξέρχεσθαι ἔξω παρεμβολῆς, xiii. 13, can only denote separation from the nation and worship of Israel with which the readers are associated.[1] This corresponds to the terribly earnest warning against apostasy that runs through the Epistle (iii. 12 f.); for from the way in which such apostasy

[1] All the arguments by which Wieseler, Hofmann, Hilgenfeld, v. Soden, and others have endeavoured to explain away this fact are quite untenable. If Paul occasionally applies to Gentile Christians prophecies which speak of promotion to be the people of God (Rom. ix. 25 f.; 2 Cor. vi. 16), it does not follow that here, where ὁ λαός (v. 3; vii. 5, 11, 27; ix. 7, 19) and ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (xi. 25) are constantly employed of the Old Testament covenant-nation, the same expression can be referred to Christendom as such in the above passages. When Paul, in Gal. iii. 29; Rom. iv. 13, 16, expressly justifies the transference of the rights of the seed of Abraham to Christians, it does not follow that the σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ in ii. 16, which, according to the only possible interpretation of ii. 11, suitable to the context, has express reference to bodily descent, can be here used in a remote sense. Whereas Paul describes Abraham as the father of believers on account of their similarity of character (Rom. iv. 11 f.), or out of his Jewish-Christian consciousness calls the ancestors of the Jews οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν though they are by no means all fathers of believers in the spiritual sense (1 Cor. x. 1; comp. Rom. iv. 1), our author speaks of his ancestors and those of his readers as οἱ πατέρες absolutely, to whom God has spoken by the prophets (i. 1). There can be no reference in xiii. 9 to the ascetic choice of meats, since it is not abstinence from certain meats but the use of them that is to strengthen the heart; and it is only by arbitrary twisting of the sense of the words that we can get over xiii. 13. Just as certainly as we fail to find with Ritschl a distinction in ix. 10 between the sacrifices that are abrogated by the offering of Christ and the other carnal ordinances to which this does not apply, so certainly does reflection on the latter show that they too formerly had a meaning for the readers.

is conceived as irrevocable (vi. 6), as the specific deadly sin (x. 26, 29) threatened with the most fearful punishment (xii. 16 f.), it follows unquestionably that the reference here is not to an error of doctrine or isolated sin, but to a relapse from Christianity into Judaism. Those addressed had already become indifferent and insensible to the preaching of the gospel of salvation (v. 11, 13); already they refused to listen to earnest exhortation and began to forsake the Church-assemblies (x. 25; xii. 25). There were already members who wavered, and who were a source of the greatest danger to the whole Church (xii. 13, 15); while the author hopes that not only the overseers (xiii. 17 f.), but also a part of the Church, would, by zealous exhortation, work according to his mind (iii. 13; x. 24 f.; xii. 15). He therefore hopes by his παράκλησις to ward off the worst (vi. 9); and the fact that he endeavours to do this by pointing out the all-sufficiency of the salvation offered in Christ and the unsatisfactory character of the Old Testament plan of salvation now done away by Him, shows irrefutably that we have here to do with relapse into Judaism.[2] From this it appears not only that the readers are Jewish Christians, but that they are exclusively Jewish Christians. It is inconceivable that in all these warnings and exhortations, which are invariably addressed to the Churches as such (No. 1), the author should

[2] It does not indeed follow that the readers looked upon sacrificial worship as necessary to the expiation of sin, as Bleek and Riehm held, and were therefore not yet converted to true Christianity, nor does it follow that they had already entirely broken with their Jewish-Christian past, as Wieseler supposed, but only that they stood in danger of finding satisfaction henceforward exclusively in the Old Testament worship which they had hitherto held to be quite compatible with their Christian faith (x. 25; xiii. 9). This too has been very decidedly disputed by Zahn and Keil; but for that reason they can only characterize the Judaism into which the readers were in danger of relapsing as without faith and without hope, *i.e.* as a Judaism that was, properly speaking, no Judaism, and as a warning against which the entire Old Testament apparatus of our Epistle was certainly not required.

never have thought of those readers who did not stand at all in the same danger; inconceivable that there should not be a word of allusion to the questions that must necessarily crop up wherever Gentile Christians lived with Jewish Christians, and especially where there was an inclination on the part of the latter to relapse into Judaism; inconceivable that along with the utterances setting forth that salvation was destined for Israel, its universal destination should not for their sakes have been assured,[3] if the Churches contained also Gentile Christians. Finally, the author in ii. 3 speaks of his readers, like himself, as having had the preaching of Jesus handed down to them by ear-witnesses, viz. by the primitive Apostles.

Notwithstanding all this, it has in recent times been again maintained by Wieseler, Hofmann, Kurtz, Zahn, Mangold, Hilgenfeld and others, in connection with erroneous views respecting the readers of the Epistle, that the Church to which the Epistle is addressed was a mixed one (comp. on the other hand Grimm, *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theol.*, 1870, 1). Lastly, Röth's view (*Epistolam vulgo ad Hebr. inscr. non ad Hebr. datam esse.* Francof. ad M., 1836), that the Epistle was entirely addressed to Gentile Christians, hitherto regarded as "a manifest error," has in pursuance of a hint of Schürer's (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1886, 4) been revived by v. Soden with great earnestness (*Jahrb. für protest Theol.*, 1884, 3). But it is just as inconceivable that the whole comparison of Christianity with Judaism should only have been intended to enable Gentile Christians by a comparison with the sole pre-Christian revelation of the Old Testament, acknowledged also by them, to see the unique significance of Christianity, as it is entirely incapable of proof, that apart from persecutions it was only laxity of morals that had enticed the readers to fall back into heathenism. It is quite an error to assume that if a relapse into Judaism were intended, the legal question in the acceptation of the Pauline Epistles must have come under discussion. It is not with the necessity

[3] Such an assurance is by no means contained in ii. 9; v. 9, since these passages, from their context, are not at all designed to restrict the participation of the Gentiles in salvation. The more obviously it lies in the nature of things that the author, whose aim it is to emancipate his readers from Judaism in order to gain them for Christianity, cannot have limited salvation to the Jews, the more incomprehensible is the absence of all allusion to the participation of the Gentiles in it where a mixed Church is addressed.

of fulfilling the law in order to attain to salvation that we have here to do, but with the sufficiency of the Old Testament institution of atonement to this end. The question as to the attitude to be adopted by the Gentiles with respect to the legal ordering of their lives, could not come up at all in a purely Jewish-Christian Church.

3. The readers of the Epistle unquestionably belong to a Church or Church-circle that had already existed for some time. That we have not to do with a Church that was but of comparatively recent origin, having arisen by the simultaneous going over of a considerable number of Jews (as Köstlin supposed), is evident from v. 12 ff., according to which the readers had been Christians long enough to be expected to have arrived at full maturity in the Christian life, and even to be capable of teaching others. The author already looks back to a past in which they had proved their Christian brotherly love (vi. 10) and had either steadfastly endured much suffering themselves or had given brotherly help to those who were persecuted (x. 32 ff.). It is manifest that the days of these persecutions, of which the author reminds them, are already somewhat remote, and moreover the persecution had consisted not only in abuse and oppression, but even in imprisonment and loss of property. The bloody persecutions of the Church as such had not yet indeed begun (xii. 4); but some of the rulers of the Church, from whom they had formerly received the preaching of the gospel (therefore the ἀκούσαντες, ii. 3), had probably sealed in martyrdom the steadfastness for which they were commended (xiii. 7). It is undoubtedly a second generation of ἡγούμενοι who now stand at the head of the Church (xiii. 24); and the fact that they no longer possess the influence they ought to have (xiii. 17) is plainly due to the critical circumstances which gave rise to the Epistle. But the immediate cause that led to the threatened danger of apostasy only appears indirectly from the exhortations of the Epistle.[1]

[1] To suppose that the readers were threatened with exclusion from the

These, however, give no indication of a special persecution having broken out, nor even of such an one as they had formerly experienced. That all kinds of oppression still continued certainly appears from the constant recurrence of admonitions to patience (x. 36; xii. 1); that they invariably turned on the reproach with which the unbelieving Jews covered their heretical countrymen is evident from xiii. 13 (comp. xi. 26); that they were threatened with the loss of their earthly possessions appears from xii. 16; while xiii. 3 shows that there were still cases of imprisonment. Yet it was not an unusual increase of persecution that made so many lose courage but its continuance. This presupposes that it had long been expected to come to an end, which could only happen by the return of the Lord which was immediately looked for. That the long and unexpected delay had led to a decline of the Christian hope associated with it is the fundamental assumption on which all the exhortations of the Epistle to the maintenance of hope are based, and the occasion of the repeated allusion to the nearness and certainty of the fulfilment of the promise (vi. 10 f., 18 f.; ix. 28; x. 25, 37; xii. 28). It is apostasy from the faith, involved in the giving up of Christian hope, and not a relapse into heathen sin, as v. Soden thinks (No. 2), that is the specific sin against which the warning of our Epistle is directed (iii. 12 f; xii. 1, 4), and which is characterized as apostasy from the living God, as fornication in the Old Testament sense of the word, and as wilful, presumptuous sin for which there is no forgiveness (iii. 12; xii. 16; x. 26, 29).

temple worship, as Ebrard and Döllinger held, or that such exclusion had already taken place, as Thiersch supposed, is manifestly an error, since this separation is just what is demanded of them in xiii. 13. That they should have wished to defend themselves against heathen persecution by placing themselves under the protection of Judaism as a *religio licita* as Kurtz and Holtzmann conjectured, is quite incredible, for such cowardice would have been combated with far other arguments than by showing that the Old Testament institutions of salvation, as imperfect, had been replaced by the more perfect dispensation of Christianity.

The other exhortations that appear in the Epistle have nothing to do with its leading aim; and it is quite inadmissible to conclude that each one is called forth by distinct moral defects in the Church. Admonition to brotherly love and its manifestation is always necessary (xiii. 1 ff., 16; comp. x. 24); that xiii. 4 f. does not refer to the cardinal vices of the heathen is shown by the fact that it is purity of marriage that is here specially inculcated; while covetousness, as appears from what follows, is nothing but attachment to earthly possessions, leading to a lack of contentment and trust in God (xiii. 5 f.) such as were specially needed where outward existence was endangered by spoliation. That the Church was threatened with any special errors connected with Essenism, such as Holtzmann following Schwegler, found attacked in the christological statements of the Epistle, does not by any means appear from xiii. 9, where, in conformity with the context, the new doctrines can only be those by which it was deemed possible to prove the all-sufficiency of the Old Testament means of salvation, and where it is not abstinence from meats but from a false estimate of meat offered in sacrifice that is spoken of (comp. No. 2, note 1).

4. So long as the Epistle to the Hebrews was ascribed to the Apostle Paul or to one of his disciples, the Church for which it was designed was naturally looked for in the Pauline missionary field; and the impossibility thus made apparent of finding one there which answered to the conditions presupposed by the Epistle is only a new proof that it does not proceed from the Pauline circle. Hence most of these views required the help of all kinds of hypotheses. The alleged reference of 2 Pet. iii. 15 to our Epistle directed Bengel's attention to the Churches of Asia Minor, in which he was followed by Cramer and Chr. F. Schmidt in their Commentaries (1757, 63). Storr (*Komm.*, 1789) and Münster (comp. § 30, 6) thought more particularly of the Jewish-Christian section of the Galatian Churches and Stein (*Komm. zu Lucas*, Halle, 1830) of the Laodicean Church, so that the Epistle was identified with that mentioned in Col. iv. 16, of which a trace was already professedly found in Philastrius, *Hær.* 89 (§ 12, 5; note 2). Credner was led by the mention of Timothy to think of his home in Lycaonia, while Credner's view of Gentile-Christian readers suggested

the thought of Ephesus to Röth. Wolf in his *Curæ* (1734), following the lead of an Englishman named Wall, thought of all the Jewish Christians of the Pauline missionary field; while Noesselt, in his *Opusc.* (1771), adopting Semler's view, confined himself to the Jewish Christians of Macedonia, particularly those at Thessalonica, thus making the Epistle a pendant to the Thessalonian Epistles, just as Storr made it supplementary to the Galatian Epistle. Weber (*De Numero Epp. ad Cor.*, Wittenb., 1798–1806), who was followed by Mack (*Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1838, 3), thought he had found here a new Corinthian epistle. Finally exegesis went back to Antioch, an hypothesis of Boehme (1825) which Hofmann has advocated anew with the greatest confidence. Ludwig (*Ap. Carpzov Sacr. Exerc.*, Helmstädt, 1750), following in the footsteps of Nicolaus v. Lyra, has traced the readers even into Spain. But just as it is clear that neither the Gentile Apostle nor one of his special disciples can have written to a purely Jewish-Christian Church, so it is impossible to fasten such a Church on the Pauline missionary field, for which reason it has been found necessary, as by Hofmann, to conceive of the Jewish-Christian part of such a Church in particular (comp. on the other hand No. 1, note 2).

5. The mention of an Epist. ad Alexandrinos in the Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 2, note 3), erroneously referred to the Epistle to the Hebrews, led to the idea of finding the readers of the latter in Alexandria. This view was adopted by J. E. Schmidt in his Introduction, as also by Ullmann whose attention in connection with the Barnabas-tradition was directed to the Jewish Christians in Cyprus and Alexandria. After the zealous advocacy of the view by Wieseler and R. Köstlin (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1854, 3) it gained wide currency for a time and was adopted by Bunsen (in his *Hippolytus*, 1852), Hilgenfeld (after 1858 in his *Zeitschrift and Einl.*), Schneckenburger (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1859), Volkmar, Ritschl, Reuss and others. Nevertheless it assumed with its chief

representatives two very distinct forms. Wieseler thought in the first place of a mixed Church, and attached most importance to the fact that the apparently inaccurate accounts respecting the temple and the priesthood (§ 30, 7, note 2) could only be explained on the assumption that the author had in his mind the temple of Onias at Leontopolis in Egypt. But he has not succeeded in furnishing the least semblance of proof that there was any difference between the temple of Onias and that in Jerusalem with respect to the points under consideration; for the only difference mentioned by Josephus has to do with the absence of the λυχνία, which is expressly mentioned in ix. 2. On the other hand the conception of the priestly liturgy contained in vii. 27 is found also in the Rabbis, as in Philo for example. Hence Köstlin has quite given this up and has returned to the view of a purely Jewish-Christian Church, whose only recent origin (comp. No. 3) he tries to account for by making x. 32 ff. refer to the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula, which is impossible. All that he adduces in favour of the Alexandrian character of the author from the language of the Epistle, the use of the Septuagint and of the Book of Maccabees, proves nothing respecting the readers except on the supposition that the author proceeded from the Church of the readers, which is not supported by xiii. 19. The fact that vi. 10 speaks of a collection for Jerusalem, to which special importance is attached on behalf of this view, only affords general proof in favour of a Church outside Palestine; but the reference of the ἅγιοι to the primitive Church is made absolutely impossible by xiii. 24. There is positively no certain ground for this view, on the contrary the fact that in Alexandria where the Epistle was so highly valued, nothing was known of this destination, but a different one taken for granted, is decidedly against it.

6. Only in connection with the view prevalent for a time that the Roman Church was essentially Jewish-Christian

(§ 22, 3), is it intelligible how it could ever have been supposed that our Epistle was addressed to Rome. The chief representative of this opinion, for which Wetstein and Baur already paved the way, is Holtzmann (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1859, 2; *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, 1; 1883, 1), to whom however Kurtz, Schenkel, Renan, Mangold, Zahn, even Harnack in incidental utterances, Pfleiderer and others have recently come over. But since the Roman Church was admittedly at least of a mixed character, and certainly became more and more Gentile-Christian after the Apostle Paul's abode there, for which reason Ewald preferred to adopt the view of another Italian town such as Ravenna, the Epistle must still be regarded as addressed only to the Jewish part of the Church, or else the readers must be looked upon as Gentile Christians, as by v. Soden, who moreover maintains that it was addressed only to Italian Christians generally. And since it is universally conceded that the greeting in xiii. 24 does not necessarily imply that those who sent salutations were Christians absent from Italy, the Greek Fathers and many later expositors having on the contrary been led to conclude from it that Italy was the place of composition, we have no indication whatever pointing to this address; for the fact that the Epistle was already known to Clement of Rome proves nothing. The attachment of the readers to the temple-worship (comp. xiii. 9–13), in which however, the Jews of the Diaspora could only occasionally take part, pre-supposed in the Epistle, is decidedly against such an hypothesis, for which reason all possible means have recently been employed to explain it away, although the Epistle in its most comprehensive details is thus rendered quite unintelligible. So too the passage xii. 4; since the author could not, in face of the persecution of Nero, which was certainly not very remote, have said that the readers had not yet resisted unto blood. It is indeed true that the readers had not yet shed their blood, which however it was

unnecessary to say; but without arbitrary weakening of the literal sense, it is impossible to get rid of the idea that no bloody persecution of the Church as such had yet taken place.

7. In the Greek Codd., as in the Syriac and Old Latin translation (according to Tertullian), the Epistle bears the superscription πρὸς Ἑβραίους. It is certain that this does not proceed from the author as Bleek was still inclined to believe, since the destination of the Epistle was undoubtedly known to the bearer; and equally certain that it represents an old tradition, which we find in the earliest mention of the Epistle by Pantænus and Clement (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 14). The name Ἑβραῖος is only in itself indeed a mark of national Jewish origin (2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5), but it also denotes the Hebrew-speaking (ἑβραϊστί John v. 2; Apoc. ix. 11, comp. Acts xxi. 40), *i.e.* Aramaic-speaking Jews as contrasted with the Hellenists (Acts vi. 1), for which reason the Hebrew composition of Matthew's Gospel is explained by its destination for Hebrews (Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1; Euseb., *H.E.*, 3, 25). But since the superscription is undoubtedly intended to point to a definite circle of readers, just as the title of the well-known εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους, it can only refer to the Hebrew-speaking Jews of Palestine, as in fact the Alexandrians assume by the way in which they explain the want of the address, and suppose a Hebrew original (§ 30, 2, note 1). To this view not only has ecclesiastical antiquity adhered, but also, despite all newer hypotheses, de Wette, Bleek and the greater number of expositors down to Keil. Since unmixed Jewish-Christian Churches were scarcely to be found in the post-Pauline time anywhere but in Palestine, and since it was only there that an attachment to the worship of the temple could arise such as the Epistle presupposes, while it treats only incidentally of those acts of worship to which in the Diaspora the greatest importance was naturally attached (ix. 10; comp.

also the ἔξω τῆς πύλης xiii. 12), this destination of the Epistle is in fact the only possible one.

The grounds on which this view is constantly represented as quite impossible are manifestly untenable. The fact that the author writes in Greek and employs the LXX. exclusively, only proves that he could read neither Hebrew nor Aramaic, although his knowledge of the Scriptures naturally enables him to reflect on the meaning of the name Melchizedek (vii. 2). But that an epistle written in Greek could not be understood in the Churches of Palestine, is a prejudice that has long been set aside (§ 30, 3). The fact that the readers stood in connection with Timothy and are greeted by Italians (xiii. 23 f.), rests on relations just as difficult to clear up in the case of every other Jewish-Christian Church, as in that of the Palestinian ones. The first generation of teachers of the Church being already dead (xiii. 1) and hence the death of Stephen, of James the son of Zebedee and James the Just, being to the author already things of the past, it is no wonder that he thinks of the Church as consisting essentially of disciples of the Apostles and not of Christ (ii. 3). The severe persecution they had suffered (x. 32 ff.) is probably that which followed the martyrdom of Stephen, a persecution which, though constantly renewed, only endangered the life of individual ἡγούμενοι. The fact that one who is not an Apostle turns to the Churches, presupposes that the Apostles no longer worked in them, which probably accounts for their having fallen into a critical condition, so that the assertion that such a state of things is inconceivable in the primitive Church, is quite untenable. The reference of vi. 10 to the collection for Jerusalem, which alone would make the received view impossible, is itself impossible (No. 5); but though it may be thought that the notorious poverty of the Church is at variance with the acts of love here commended, as also with the exhortation to hospitality and beneficence (xiii. 2, 16), yet our author did not find them incompatible with that spoiling of goods (x. 34) which was unquestionably the ground of such poverty, or with the exhortation to contentment (xiii. 5). If however the Churches in Palestine were in question, the Epistle would naturally have gone in the first place to Jerusalem.[1]

[1] Hase (*Winer's u. Engelh. krit. Journal*, II. 2) put forward the very fanciful idea of an heretical Church in a remote district of Palestine, while Grimm thought of the Church in Jamnia.

§ 32. The Situation of the Hebrew Epistle with respect to Time.

1. For determining the time of the Hebrew Epistle, the question as to whether it already presupposes the destruction of the temple or not, is decisive. It has been urged with great force, especially by Holtzmann, that all the passages describing the arrangements of the Old Testament worship in the present tense (viii. 8, 20; viii. 3–5; ix. 6–9, 13; xiii. 10) do not prove that this worship still existed in the time of the author, a fact only indeed made fully evident when with v. Soden we note that our Epistle does not concern itself with actually existing arrangements, but with the typically prophetic statements of Holy Scripture respecting them (§ 30, 7, note 2). But on the other hand it must be maintained that, according to the view of our Epistle, the old covenant comes to an end with the accomplishment of the high-priestly offering of Christ; and that with the new covenant the Messianic time has begun, so that neither ix. 1, nor yet the fact that the author speaks not of the temple but of the tabernacle, forms any argument against the existence of the temple at that time.[1] But the manifest object (§ 31, 2, 3) of the statements the Epistle contains respecting the insufficiency of the Old Testament worship and the fulfilment in Christ of that which it had striven in vain to accomplish, is quite decisive. It is impossible that

[1] Nothing at all follows from viii. 13, where it is only inferred from the announcement of a new covenant in prophecy, that the old one is characterized as about to vanish away; nothing at all from ix. 9 f., where the Old Testament time, to which the arrangement of the tabernacle corresponded, is only contrasted with the Messianic time as the καιρὸς διορθώσεως; nothing at all from x. 2, which contains only a reflection on the cessation of sacrifice in the event of its object having been attained. So too the passage xiii. 14 is sometimes employed as an argument in favour of the continued existence of Jerusalem, and sometimes against it, and is decisive for neither. The chronology based on the passage iii. 9, is entirely uncertain and improbable.

these statements with their minuteness of detail and intermixture with the most urgent warnings against a relapse into Judaism, can be designed to establish in a purely theoretical way the pre-eminence of Christianity over Judaism; they can only be intended to show that the readers cannot find in the Old Testament worship what they have found in Christ, and must lose by apostasy from Him. This very thing, however, implies the existence of such worship; and it must have been the idea of a possible rebuilding of the temple and restoration of its worship which first led to the actual discussion of the judgment of God apparent in its existing state of decay, since it is in truth inconceivable that the Jewish-Christian author should not in his argument have turned this fact to account, as perhaps the Barnabas epistle does in chap. iv. 16. If therefore the Epistle was written before the year 70, it was undoubtedly not written before the death of James; for while this apostolic-minded man stood at the head of the Church, one who was not an Apostle would certainly not have felt himself called upon to exhort it in such wise on his own behalf. We are thus led beyond the middle of the seventh decade. But the Epistle, even if addressed to Palestine, could not possibly have been written during the Jewish war without making any allusion to it whatever; on the contrary, it was more probably written during the threatening symptoms of its breaking forth, since the author sees in the signs of the times the coming of the day of the Lord (Heb. x. 25), which Christ had placed in immediate connection with it (Matt. xxiv. 15).

Those who set out with the Pauline authorship of the Epistle mostly put it in the Roman captivity, except where the hypotheses regarding the readers of the Epistle necessitated still more fanciful combinations. Though Bleek tried to bring it down to 68–69 A.D. (comp. Grimm), more recent expositors with little variation have adhered to the year 66, at which from different views of the Epistle, Wieseler and Hilgenfeld, Tholuck and Ewald, Riehm and Köstlin, Lünemann, Kurtz and Kiel have practically arrived. Zahn alone comes down to the year 80. The

Tübingen school endeavoured to bring it down to the end of the 1st century, Volkmar, Hausrath and Keim even to the end of Trajan's time, while Holtzmann, Schenkel, Mangold and v. Soden thought they recognised in the Epistle traits of the Domitian persecution, of which however there is as little trace as of any other particular persecution.

2. The great importance of the Hebrew Epistle consists in the fact that it affords a glance into the development of the primitive Church at a time when a severe crisis was at hand. It was not the legal question that disturbed the Church.[1] But the hopes with which the primitive Church had formerly looked forward gradually to gain over the nation as such to confess Christ had not been fulfilled. The opposition of the unbelieving mass of the nation to the primitive Church living and working in their midst became more and more pronounced. Though matters seldom came to bloodshed, yet reproach and oppression of every kind increased rather than diminished. In place of the hoped-for golden age that was to bring the Messiah, a time of severe calamity had set in; and the only thing that could bring about a change, viz. the return of the exalted Lord, which was so near and so ardently expected, was wanting. Under these circumstances the question must come home to the Church, whether they had found in faith in the Messiah Jesus what they had formerly sought, whether the sacrifices they were obliged to make daily for His sake in separating from their countrymen, were really rewarded. Moreover the

[1] We have seen how from the beginning the Church adhered faithfully to the law of the fathers (§ 14, 1), regarding the Old Testament worship as quite consistent with hope in the return of the Messiah manifested in Jesus. The development given to the cause of Christianity by the great Gentile Apostle, which it was hard for them to withstand, had indeed been more and more favourable to the rise of a party zealous for the law, who thought it necessary to protect the law of the fathers, which was apparently threatened by the success of the free gospel (Acts xxi. 20). But the zealots for the law had not succeeded in disturbing the development brought in by Paul in the outlying heathen lands; and for the primitive Church itself this development had no great significance, since adherence to the law was here beyond dispute.

old covenant, with its law and devotional exercises, its offerings and means of grace furnished them with what they required in order to live piously and enjoy communion with the God of their fathers. Nor had their old teachers and leaders, some of whom had been taken from them by death while others had gone out from them, ever taught them to attach small value to such things; and the coming of the blessed consummation of the kingdom of the Messiah which these had so confidently announced, and in hope of which they had hitherto overcome all antagonism between the present and the promised future of the prophets, seemed to be further and further removed, and to become more and more uncertain. Under these circumstances a suspicious inclination to give up faith in the Messiah and become reconciled to their fellow-countrymen, in association with whom they might once more content themselves with the worship of their fathers, began to gain ground. Adherence to the law and the worship of their fathers, which had formerly had so good a motive, the bond of national communion so faithfully cherished with the object of gaining the nation as a whole, had become directly fatal. The approach of the great revolutionary war increased the exasperation of the nation against the apostates in their midst, while inflaming all their patriotic feeling and bringing back to their consciousness the full value of the sanctuaries for which the final struggle was to be fought. Then it was that a man who had formerly lived for a long time in the Church, and yet owing to his Hellenic descent and lengthened absence from it had retained a more unprejudiced view, recognised the exceeding danger of the situation and saw the only means of averting it. It was important now to effect the resolute emancipation of the Jewish-Christian primitive Church from fellowship of nation and worship with the Jewish people, an emancipation such as had already been accomplished under the influence of Paulinism in the case of

the Jewish Christians of the Diaspora. The Epistle to the Hebrews, while urging this decisive step (xiii. 14), prepares the way for it by a copious statement of the motives which justified this definitive breach of Jewish Christianity with its past, and even made it obligatory.

3. Since the author had no authoritative position in the Church of his readers, nor did any personal relations exist that led him to write, he makes the subject of which he treats speak for itself. But even here he does not set out with the circumstances of the Church and the necessary admonition and warning, but with the presupposition which he has in common with a Messiah-believing Church formed out of Israel, viz. that God has spoken to the Church of the last days by His Messiah as He had formerly spoken to the fathers by the prophets. After having laid the foundation of the unique exaltation of this Son to an equality with God in the government of the world, in His original essence and primeval position, in a high-sounding period exhibiting at once the lofty strain and the fulness of his oratorical pathos which would have been weakened by any epistolary introduction, and having confirmed it by His relation to the angels—the highest order of created beings (i. 1–4), he proceeds to prove his utterances respecting Him step by step from the Old Testament. To no angel, as to Him, has God given the name of son in a unique sense; on the contrary He has set before Him in prospect as the Firstborn among the heavenly sons of God the worship of all angels at the end of His course (i. 5 f.). Whereas God calls the angels His ministers, who according to the needs of their service experience many changes in the kingdom of nature, He has anointed Him above His fellows to an eternal Divine supremacy; for the Son who took part in the foundation of all created things remains superior to all the chances and changes to which these are subject (i. 7–12). To none of the angels has God ever promised a seat on His throne such as

the completion of the Messianic kingdom secures to Him; they are only ministering spirits appointed to help others to participation in the Messianic salvation (i. 13 f.).[1] This leads to the application of the discussion to such as, like the Messiah-believing Church, are destined to participate in the Messianic deliverance (forming the obverse side of the Messianic consummation) and yet can only do so by adhering with all diligence to the word of God which they had heard from this unique Ambassador, not allowing themselves to be carried away by the current of the times (ii. 1). For if the word of the law, already made known by means of angels, brought righteous retribution on all who transgressed or neglected to hear it, how shall they escape the destruction that accompanies the Messianic completion who neglect the word of salvation first proclaimed by the Divine Lord Himself and confirmed to us by them that heard Him, especially since God Himself has attested it by signs and wonders which by the communication of the Holy Spirit He directed those who preached it to perform according to His will (ii. 2–4)? The general, practical inference drawn from the theoretical introductory statement shows that this section is regarded as an introduction.

4. Only now does the author turn to the *first* consideration that bears specially on the need of the readers. Adhering

[1] A polemic against views that aimed at lowering the exaltation of Christ more or less by putting Him on a par with the angels is looked for in vain in this theological exposition. It is only because His exalted position with respect to the world is measured by his relation to the angels that it is made the proper theme of this exposition (i. 4). Just as the author's statement regarding Him began by giving Him the name of Son in an exclusive sense (i. 2) and concluded with His elevation to a seat on the throne of God (i. 3), so the Scripture argument begins and ends in conformity with these two points (i. 5 f. ; i. 13 f.). The intervening statement sets out in a reverse order with the nature and vocation of the angels (i. 7), in order to prove also from the Scripture (i. 8 f. ; i. 10 ff.) what had been said respecting the Godlike essence of the Son and His original relation to the world (i. 2 f.).

to the fundamental thought of the introductory disquisition, he proves that it is not the angels but the Son of man, who, though for a time made lower than the angels, was crowned with glory and honour; to whom, according to the word of the psalmist, all things were put in subjection, and consequently the time of the Messianic salvation, which is the subject under discussion in a writing of the Messiah-believing author to his readers (ii. 5–8). If the perfect fulfilment of this promise be still delayed, it has already begun in the exaltation of Jesus. Moreover the way in which this was granted to Him for the sake of His sufferings in death was conditioned by the Divine purpose of salvation. For it was only by assuming the same ancestry as the seed of Abraham, which He was to take upon Himself as the Mediator of salvation, in order to lead them to deliverance and to glory, and by being made partaker with them of the same flesh and blood, subject to suffering, that He could taste the whole bitterness of death in their stead in order to free them from all fear of death; and by the sufferings He endured, being tempted, that as a faithful high priest He could help those who are tempted through suffering (ii. 8–18).[1] It is for the very reason that they are thus tempted by suffering that the author now turns to his readers as brethren who through Christ have attained to true salvation, having become partakers of the heavenly calling, requiring them to fix their glance on the fidelity of Jesus, whom with him they recognise as the Ambassador and High Priest of God (iii. 1). Moses verily was faithful in the house of God, in which he

[1] This defence of the sufferings and death of Christ may certainly indicate that, with the fear lest the glorious second coming of Christ should not be fulfilled, the old offence of the cross had again begun to disturb the minds of the readers; but the positive aim of the discussion is to show the readers, who are again in bondage to the fear of death and dread of suffering, how their Messiah, raised to Divine supremacy, is by His passion qualified to free them from their bondage and to succour them in every temptation.

served Him as a witness for that which was to be spoken to the nation; but the Messiah as the Son who in the capacity of Founder of this house was exalted high above Moses, rules faithfully over it, and in this rule they may confidently trust, if by firm adherence to the Christian hope they remain members of the true theocracy (iii. 2–6).[2] Hence by way of exhortation and warning the author holds up to them the word of the psalmist, in which, reminding them how formerly their fathers, led out of Egypt by Moses, had in their march through the wilderness failed to enter into the rest of God, he warns them against hardening their hearts in the same way (iii. 7–11). For again there is danger lest by want of faith in the Divine promise any should harden their hearts and thus lose all participation in the Messiah, which can only be preserved by holding fast the confidence unto the end (iii. 12–15); and should fall under the same chastisement as befell the generation in the wilderness (iii. 16–19). It would be a disastrous error for them to suppose that they had lost the ancient promise of God (by the temptation of suffering that had come upon them as an actual consequence of their faith); for as their forefathers had received the joyful message (of the near fulfilment of the promise), so too had they. But just as it availed the former nothing because they remained in unbelief, so it was by faith alone that they too could enter into the rest of God, which was already prepared from the time of the Creation-Sabbath, but was closed by the wrath of God against the generation in the wilderness

[2] The comparison of Christ with Moses cannot possibly form a parallel to the comparison of Christ with the angels (chap. i.), in order to complete the account of the elevation of Christ, since Christ's exaltation above the angels naturally implies that He was raised above Moses. On the contrary it is only the discussion of the fidelity of Christ that brings the author to speak of the fidelity of Moses, for the readers in turning from the former to the latter suppose they may find satisfaction in the blessings of salvation already promised by Moses to the people of the Old Testament theocracy, and which, in accordance with his fidelity, must be fulfilled.

on account of their unbelief (iv. 1–5). Hence this Psalm, which must necessarily be interpreted in a Messianic sense (comp. iv. 8), fixes a new day, when it will depend on the attention paid to the warning against obduracy, whether those who have again received the message of the approaching fulfilment of salvation attain to the hitherto unfulfilled promise, and enter into the eternal Sabbath-rest prepared for the people of God and prefigured by the divine rest (iv. 6–10). It is therefore important for them to use all diligence lest they fall into the same unbelief as the generation in the wilderness; and the word of God in the Psalm, which reveals the deepest depths of the heart, laying bare and judging even the most secret beginnings of sin, is able to awaken this zeal in us (iv. 11–13).

5. While the first reflection contained only an indirect intimation that the readers, or at least some of them, were in danger of giving up the fulfilment of the former promise of God and the faith which leads to the expectation of such fulfilment, amid the sufferings of the present, the *second* begins with an exhortation to draw nigh to the throne of grace, trusting in the High Priest who has passed into the heavens in order to obtain His intercessory help in their temptation, since He is not wanting in the feeling for our infirmities necessary to every high priest, inasmuch as He also was tempted in all points like as we are (iv. 14–v. 3). And since it was necessary that He, like Aaron, should be expressly called to be a High Priest, God proclaimed Him whom He designated His Son in an exclusive sense, a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek, because, being tried by the severest suffering, He had by His perfect obedience qualified Himself to be the Author of an eternal salvation (v. 4–10). The Apostle having thus come to the theme of his second reflection, the doubt is forced upon him that his readers, owing to the low state of their Christian intelligence, might not be in a position to follow him (v. 11–14). It is

his purpose indeed to leave nothing untried in order to lead them on to perfection, not by again making known the principles of the doctrine of Christ, but by initiating them into the depths of Christian truth, provided God permit; for He knows that where actual apostasy had taken place, according to His holy arrangement it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance by such enunciation of principles (vi. 1–8). But trusting in God, who will not allow the loving zeal they had formerly manifested to go unrewarded, he is persuaded better things of them, and hopes still to be able to awaken them to the full assurance of hope enduring unto the end, such as will make them followers of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises (vi. 9–12). For as God, by the oath with which He sealed His promise, enabled Abraham to endure patiently, so the hope of the Christian is an anchor to the soul, which remains immutable in the heavenly holy of holies, whither Jesus as our Forerunner has entered on our behalf, having been made a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (vi. 13–20). The author has thus come back to the subject of this reflection, and is now anxious to make it clear to his readers what is meant by the Messiah being a High Priest like Melchizedek, of whom the Scriptures record neither descent nor end of life, so that his priesthood has no end (vii. 1–3). In the first place it follows from the fact that Abraham, and in him the Levites themselves, paid tithes to Melchizedek, that the priesthood of Melchizedek was exalted above that of Aaron (vii. 4–10), and from the fact that Christ did not spring from the tribe of Levi but from the tribe of Judah, and that He received His priesthood not on the ground of human descent but on the ground of His endless life, it follows that He was different from all others (vii. 11–17). But a change of priesthood, involving a change of the whole law, can only take place if this latter prove powerless to attain its object, the final attainment of which is now said to be in prospect.

That the question turns on this point is shown by the oath with which God instituted the priesthood of Melchizedek, which, owing to its eternal duration, can be replaced by no other, but attains its aim completely and for all time (vii. 20–25); and the service of which, on account of the sinless perfection of its Bearer, no longer needs to be interrupted by the offering of sacrifice for Himself (vii. 26–28), for His ministry is not in the earthly sanctuary, which is a mere copy, but in the archetypal heavenly one (viii. 1–5).[1]

6. Since it was already intimated in vii. 22 that the high priest is also the surety of a better covenant, the *third* reflection reaches the true climax at which the author wishes to arrive. Messianic prophecy opens up the prospect of a new covenant, which could only have been needed in case it promised to realize what the old one was unable to accomplish; and the chief thing which it promises is the full forgiveness of sins, which the service of the Messianic high priest is to bring (viii. 6–13). This is already foreshadowed in the arrangement of the sanctuary in the old covenant, inasmuch as the permanent separation of the forecourt from the place of the Divine gracious presence proves that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were unable to procure the perfection necessary to true communion with God, being only carnal ordinances imposed provisionally like all other legal observances (ix. 1–10). But Christ by His own blood entered into the heavenly sanctuary and pro-

[1] This concludes the argument that with the priesthood of Melchizedek the hope of the final fulfilment of the promise is not only sealed by the Divine oath, but is also assured by the exaltation of Christ to heaven (vi. 19 f.). Here too the theological exposition serves the purpose of confirming the wavering Christian hope; and with true wisdom it is now first intimated that the replacement of the Aaronic priesthood by the higher one of Melchizedek can only be explained by the fact that the former did not achieve its object of making the fulfilment of the promise possible, so that every attempt to give up faith in the Messiah and His high priesthood and to find satisfaction once more in the former priesthood, is *a priori* rendered abortive.

cured an eternal salvation, for this blood is able not only to sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, like the Old Testament means of grace, but is able to purge the conscience entirely from the stain of guilt and to fit it for the true service of God. Thus by His death He became the Mediator of a new covenant, and by redemption of the transgressions committed under the first, guaranteed the final reception of the former covenant-promise (ix. 11–15). After the author, ingeniously playing with the double meaning of the word διαθήκη and alluding to the promise of the new covenant given in the appointment of the Last Supper, has laid it down as a premiss that a testamentary disposition only comes into force if the death of the testator be proved (ix. 16 f.), he proceeds to show that even the Old Testament was not dedicated without the blood of the covenant-offering, and that under it there was no forgiveness of sins without the shedding of blood (ix. 18–22). But Christ in the fulness of time entered once into the heavenly sanctuary, in order in the presence of God to blot out entirely the guilt of sin, the punishment of which He had borne in His sacrificial death; and will return only for the definitive redemption of His own (ix. 23–28). In this way the author proves that the yearly sacrifices of the great day of atonement could not effect their purpose of restoring the true holiness of the covenant-nation, as already shown by the need of their constant repetition and their rejection by the word of prophecy, which demands the offering of His body from the Messiah (x. 1–10). Moreover the daily sacrifices designed to set individuals free from their sins, are equally ineffectual, since the Messiah by His own offering brought final perfection by means of the complete forgiveness of sins promised with the new covenant, which made all further sacrifice unnecessary (x. 11–18). It is now first shown that *only* in the new covenant the readers can find that which the old covenant neither could nor was designed to effect

while the author here first breaks forth in the highest strain of his oratorical pathos into the exhortation that they should hold fast the Christian hope, trusting in the blood of Jesus and the government of the exalted High Priest, and instead of forsaking the Christian assemblies, as they had begun to do, should zealously make use of them for the purpose of mutual exhortation, in face of the visible approach of the day of judgment (x. 19–25). He now sets forth the fearful fate that awaits them, if after conscious rejection of the Son of God and of the salvation brought by Him, there remains no more sacrifice for their sin, but only the judgment of an angry God (x. 26–31). He reminds them of the better days they had had, and exhorts them not to cast away their confidence, but in steadfastness of faith to fulfil the condition on which the attainment of the promise depends, reminding them yet again of the prophecy of the near coming of the Lord who brings life and deliverance from destruction only to those who believe (x. 32–39). That this faith is confidence in what is hoped for, as well as a firm conviction of the invisible, is now shown by the example of all the pious under the old covenant, to whom the Scripture bears witness on account of their faith (chap. xi.); the readers being called upon to fight a good fight in the presence of these witnesses, looking unto Jesus who presented the highest type of such faith (xii. 1–3). He reminds them that the suffering and temptation they have endured are only marks of the fatherly love of God, whose purpose it is to lead them by His chastening to full participation in His holiness (xii. 4–11); and exhorts them to rise as one man from their despondency and to strive together that the holiness of the Church, without which it cannot arrive at perfection, be not defiled by individual apostates, who, having incurred the guilt of Esau, must likewise share his punishment (xii. 12–17). In conclusion, by a sublime comparison between that which Israel gained with their

entrance into the new covenant, and what they had suffered under the old one (xii. 18–24), he sets before them the immense weight of responsibility they incur if they refuse to listen to Him who speaks from heaven, who will soon shake heaven and earth to bring about the final decision (xii. 25–29).[1]

7. Before the author comes to the last positive admonition to which he is leading up, he takes a new start, as if the final exhortation were concerned only with what is necessary for all Christians. He admonishes to brotherly love and its active manifestation, to the preservation of the purity of marriage, to contentment and to confidence in God (xiii. 1–6). But he returns immediately to the main theme of the Epistle, exhorting them to remember those who first preached the word of God to them, whose faith they are to follow, because Jesus Christ whom they preached remains the same for ever (xiii. 7 f.). He now warns them against the new doctrines by which in divers ways it had been sought to prove that even without faith in the Messiah and the grace of God mediated by Him, it was possible to attain to the certainty of salvation, by zealous participation in the Old Testament worship with its sacrificial feasts. In accordance with the Old Testament ordinances themselves, it was impossible indeed to partake of the altar of the new covenant, since it was not permitted to eat of a sin-offering

[1] It is manifestly with a view to instruction that the author does not point the exhortation of the epistle directly to the final aim he has in view. Just as he passed from the most general exhortation to the hearing of the word preached by God's unique and final Ambassador, so in the three leading ideas of his Epistle he warns them with increasing urgency against apostasy and exhorts them to hold fast the Christian hope in faith in the salvation procured by the Messianic High Priest; but only in the second is it intimated that His exaltation above the Levitical priests proves that the Old Testament means of grace were powerless to effect what had been done by this Priest, much less to replace what is relinquished in giving up faith in Him; while only in the third leading idea is this established on all sides.

such as that by which Christ had led the nation to true holiness. On the contrary, just as the bodies of sin-offerings were burned without the camp, so Christ suffered death without the gate. It was necessary therefore for them to go forth unto Him bearing His reproach, viz. to give up all social connection with the old covenant nation, as well as all participation in their worship, looking for the future and truly continuing city; and only to seek to please God by offering Him the fruit of their lips and by doing good as a thank-offering (xiii. 9–16). The author thus gives expression to what in his view contains the sole deliverance from the ever-growing dangers of the present, putting it with full intention in the form of hints such as could not be mistaken by those who understood and laid the arguments of the Epistle to heart. Those with whom this was not the case were at least not to be frightened back by a too emphatic statement of this last consequence. He urges them to obey their rulers, of whom he hopes that they will act in the spirit of his Epistle, and commends himself to their prayers, not without intimating that he has some doubt whether his attitude towards the questions of the day will be universally approved. He concludes finally with a full-sounding benediction (xiii. 18–21). An epistolary postscript again solicits a friendly reception for his word of exhortation, makes a communication with regard to Timothy, with whom he hopes shortly to come, if their prayers on his behalf (xiii. 19) are heard, salutes all the rulers and members of the Church, sends greetings from some members of it who are at the time in Italy, with whom he seems to have spoken when there,[1] and again concludes with a brief salutation (xiii. 22–25).

[1] From this interpretation of the words οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, which is at all events the most probable, it follows that the author was no longer in Italy, as was formerly frequently held in connection with the view of its composition during Paul's Roman captivity. But we have no data for a more accurate determination of the place where the Epistle was written.

SECOND DIVISION.

THE REVELATION OF JOHN.

§ 33. The Apostle John.

1. John (Jehochanan or Jochanan, *i.e.* whom Jehovah has graciously given) was the son of a fisherman at the Lake of Gennesareth, of the name of Zebedee (Zebadia), who cannot have been without means, since he carried on his trade with hired servants (Mark i. 19 f.). Since James is in ancient tradition always named before him, he seems to have been the younger brother, Luke alone putting him first as better known to him (Luke viii. 51; ix. 28; Acts i. 13). Salome, mentioned in Mark xv. 40 f. among the women who had supported Jesus in Galilee and followed Him to the cross, is described in the parallel passage (Matt. xxvii. 56) as the mother of the sons of Zebedee. Called from the beginning along with the sons of Jonas into the circle of Christ's constant companions, they afterwards appear with Simon as the most intimate friends of Jesus in the circle of the Twelve (Mark v. 37; ix. 2; xiv. 33; comp. xiii. 3); so that they were bold enough to ask for the highest places of honour in the consummated kingdom of the Messiah (x. 37), a request which Matthew tried to impute solely to the weakness of a mother's heart (xx. 20). When Jesus on one occasion called them the Sons of Thunder (iii. 17), their fiery temperament is shown in the zealous wrath with which they wanted to call down fire from heaven on the Samaritan village that refused to receive the Master (Luke ix. 54); in the firmness of purpose with which they were ready to suffer the worst for the sake of the highest they

coveted (Mark x. 38 f.); and in the intolerance boasted of by John, with which they forbad the exorcist who would not join the circle of the disciples, to use the name of Jesus in casting out devils (Mark ix. 38).

The fourth Gospel by no means justifies the conclusion that the family were not located at the Lake of Gennesareth, as Caspari maintained (*chronol. geogr. Einl. in d. Leben Jesu*, Hamburg, 1869), since the business transactions of the father might easily have led to John's being known (naturally among the servants) in the house of the high priest Annas (John xviii. 15). There is no doubt that the younger of the sons of Zebedee is the unnamed disciple of the fourth Gospel, who had already been a follower of the Baptist and had come into the company of Jesus at the Jordan (John i. 35–40). He seems to have returned with Him to Galilee, to have accompanied Him on His first journey to the feast and during His ministry of baptism in Judea, as also in His journey through Samaria (John ii.–iv.), for which reason Mark too (i. 19 f.) seems to have taken it for granted that Jesus, in the beginning of His Galilean ministry, called him with his elder brother to be His constant companions. While early tradition only makes him one of the three confidential friends, he appears here as the disciple for whom the Lord had a special affection and to whom at the Last Supper He gave the place of honour at His right hand (John xiii. 23; xx. 2; comp. xxi. 20). Here too his ardent devotion to the Master impels him first to follow Him into the palace of the high priest, and then to remain by the cross when all had left Him (xviii. 15; xix. 26). Assuming, as is natural, that the three women in John xix. 25 are the same mentioned in early tradition, and that Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ cannot be the sister of Jesus's mother, since two other sisters have the same name, it is far more probable that Salome was this sister and the sons of Zebedee therefore cousins of Jesus (comp. Weiseler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 3). This is the best explanation of the fact that these two brethren with Simon, formed the closest circle of the confidential friends of Jesus, and that they ventured on a request such as that in Mark x. 37, as also of the intimate relation of Jesus to the younger of them, to whose filial care He confided His mother even from the cross (John xix. 26 f.).

But while the elder brother played so prominent a part in the primitive Church that the enmity of the Jews cost him his life earliest (Acts xii. 1 f.), the passionate love of John for his Master seems to have found satisfaction in exclusive devotion to Him and loving absorption in His nature. He was not adapted for active outside work; the

Acts show him only in pliant dependence on the forcible and predominant nature of Peter (iii. i. 3 f., 11; iv. 13, 19; viii. 14). At the so-called Apostolic Council (Acts xv.) he is quite in the background, although Paul names him among the pillars of the Church (Gal. ii. 9). During Paul's first visit to Jerusalem he must have been temporarily absent (Gal. i. 19); but the fact that he is not mentioned at all on his last visit (Acts xxi. 17 f.) only shows that he was not the leading personality there. He seems never to have resolved on independent missionary work; but when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, in view of the near approach of the last revolutionary war, John must already have been absent from Jerusalem for a considerable time (§ 32, 1).

2. Early tradition unanimously points to Asia Minor and Ephesus in particular, as the scene of the later activity of John.[1] He cannot indeed have transferred his abode thither

[1] It is only in connection with the opposition to the fourth Gospe that this tradition has lately been rejected as unhistorical, first by Lützelberger (*die kirchl. Tradition über d. Apostel Joh.*, Leipz. 1840), whose exposition was at that time almost universally repudiated (but comp. Weisse, *Jahrb. f. wiss. Krit.* 1840) as extravagant (comp. Schwegler in the *Theolog. Jahrb.*, 1842); then "with dazzling ingenuity and the full pathos of certain victory" by Keim (*Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*, Zürich, 1867); who were immediately followed by Wittichen (*der geschichtl. Character d. Evang. Joh.*, Elberf. 1868), Holtzmann (Schenkel's *Bibellexicon*, III., 1871), Scholten (*der Apostel Joh.*, Berlin, 1872), Schenkel (1873), Weiffenbach (*d. Papiasfragment*, Giessen, 1874) and others, (comp. especially Holtzmann in his *Introduction*). On the other hand the Tübingen school proper (comp. especially Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift*, 1867, 1; 68, 2; 72, 3; 73, 1; 74, 3; 75, 2) has energetically repelled this criticism. Comp. even Lüdemann, *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1879, 3, also Renan, Krenkel (*der Apostel Joh.*, Berlin, 1871), Overbeck, Weizsäcker, Mangold, Völter and others. Whereas Ewald (*Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1867, 41) would scarcely take it in earnest, it has been attacked in detail by Steitz (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, 3 and Art. *Joh. d. Presb.* in Schenkel's *Bibellex.*, III., 1871), W. Grimm. (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, 1), Leuschner (*das Evang. Joh.*, Halle, 1873), Luthardt (*der Joh. Ursprung des 4 Evang.*, Leipz. 1874), Keil (*Komm. z. Johannes Evang.*, 1884) and others.

during the life-time of Paul, since neither the farewell speech of Paul to the Ephesian presbyters (Acts xx.) nor his Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Timothy, make any mention of him; but of course it does not follow from this that he may not have there found a new field for his guiding and fostering activity after Paul's martyrdom.[2] On the other hand the tradition respecting the abode of John in Asia Minor goes back indirectly to Polycarp. For in an Epistle to Florinus the companion of his youth, Irenæus reminds him of the intercourse he had with Polycarp in early youth, a thing still vividly remembered; and of the communications made by Polycarp respecting his association with John and others who had seen the Lord (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 20). So too Irenæus holds up to the Roman bishop Victor the conduct of his predecessor Anicetus, when Polycarp appealed before him to John the disciple of the Lord and the other Apostles with whom he had celebrated the passover after the manner peculiar to Asia Minor (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 24). Finally we are also indebted to Polycarp for the narrative of John's meeting with Cerinthus, when the former, quite in the spirit of the synoptical Son of Thunder, fears lest the bathing-house should fall upon this enemy of the truth (Iren., *adv. Hær.*, III. 3, 4, comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 28; 4, 14). With respect also to Papias of Hierapolis, Irenæus states that he had been an ἀκούστης of John (*adv. Hær.*, V. 33, 4); while Eusebius in his *Chron. ad*

[2] There is nothing strange in the silence of the Petrine Epistles respecting him even if they are spurious, since they too in accordance with the presumption they imply, belong to a time antecedent to the activity of the Apostle in Asia Minor. The fact that Ignatius of Antioch, who is not made his disciple until the 4th century, does not mention him in his Epistle to the Ephesians, can prove nothing to the contrary, since he only alludes to Paul because he too had come to the Ephesians on his way to death (xii. 2); and in xi. 2 expressly assumes that the Ephesians had other Apostles dwelling among them besides Paul. Polycarp of Smyrna in his writing to the Pauline Church at Philippi had no occasion to mention him whatever.

Olymp., 419, 2 also describes him as auditor Johannis.[3] Among the presbyters regarding whose utterances Papias had made inquiry from their companions, he names first, it is true, a number of Apostles who were already dead at the time when he instituted his enquiries (*τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θῶμας ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἤ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν*),[4] and afterwards the disciples of the Lord who were still alive (*ἅτε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν*), of whose utterances therefore he was able to learn most (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 39). But just as it does not follow from the fact that he rests chiefly on their traditions, that he had personal intercourse with them, so these inquiries do not justify the conclusion that John was not among the presbyters from whom according to the beginning of the Fragment he still received personal instruction, though only in his earliest youth (*ὅσα ποτὲ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καλῶς ἔμαθον καὶ καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα*); so that Irenæus may be right in calling him *ἀκούστης Ἰωάννου*.

In order to shut out this possibility and to be able to contest the abode of the Apostle John in Asia Minor, the expression *πρεσβύτεροι* has been made to refer only to Apostolic disciples or even to Elders of the Church (comp. Weiffenbach *ante*, also *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1877, 2, 3), although Papias evidently understands by them the men of the first Christian generation who in his day were gradually dying out, with whom in the

[3] On the other hand the latter certainly thought it necessarily followed from the preface of Papias to his Exegeses of the Lord's words, that he had not been an *ἀκροάτης καὶ αὐτόπτης* of John, but an *αὐτήκοος* of Aristion and the Presbyter John, in support of which he appeals to the fact that Papias cites many traditions of these very two (*H. E.*, 3, 39). Even Hilgenfeld recognised that this rests on a false apprehension of the words of Papias (*Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1875, 77).

[4] Keim appeals to the fact that John is only mentioned among the Apostles at the very last, and could therefore certainly not have been intimately known to Papias, but it is quite easy to understand that Papias should have named those two Apostles last from whose pen evangelical works had been handed down and with whose oral sayings he was therefore less concerned. Comp. § 5, 7.

following passage he expressly reckons the Apostles and those immediate disciples of the Lord who were still alive at his time. To deny this it is necessary to distort the plain words (εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρ. ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν — — ἅτε Ἀριστ. — — λέγουσιν) to mean that he had subjected to a careful examination the statements of the presbyters respecting what the Apostles and the Lord's disciples had said. On the other hand Leimbach (*das Papiasfragm.*, Gotha, 1875, comp. Art. *Papias* in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.*, XI., 1883) following Guericke, Hengstenberg, Lange, Zalm (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1886, 4), Klostermann (*Marcusev.*, 1867), Riggenbach (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, 2) maintained that by presbyters Papias understood only Apostles, and consequently that the Presbyter John named together with Aristion was none other than the Apostle, and that it was a mistake to make this Fragment refer to another John. But Papias discriminates most clearly between the John named among Apostles only, and the John so-called in distinction from him from his position as ruler of the Church, who could not possibly have been described along with Aristion as a disciple of the Lord, such as the previously named Apostles certainly were, if only in a wide sense. It is thus established that there were two disciples of the Lord of the name of John, one of whom was the Apostle, the other a mere presbyter; moreover two graves of John were still shown at Ephesus in the time of Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb., *H.E.*, 7, 25).

3. The indirect testimony of Justin Martyr, who ascribes the Johannine Apocalypse to the Apostle, is of decisive importance for the credibility of the tradition of the residence of the Apostle John in Asia Minor (§ 7, 4). The author of this book says that he was in the island of Patmos for the purpose of receiving the revelations imparted to him (i. 9), and sent the record of them to the seven Churches of Asia Minor with whose external and internal relations he was accurately acquainted (i. 4), first to Ephesus the metropolis of Asia Minor (i. 11), which therefore was probably his real abode. It is true John does not call himself an Apostle (i. 4; xxii. 8), but only a servant of Christ (i. 1), their brother and companion in tribulation (i. 9); but Paul is the Apostle of the Churches of Asia Minor to which John writes, and he never writes to them with apostolic, but only with prophetic authority (comp. i. 3, οἱ λόγοι τῆς προφητείας,

comp. x. 11). On the other hand the claim this self-designation makes to be sufficiently intelligible to the circle of readers, can only be explained on the assumption that this John was none other than the Apostle, whose fiery spirit (No. 1) moreover speaks plainly enough in the imaginative description of the judgment of an angry God; as also in the fearful threats and enticing promises of the book.[1] Papias was already acquainted with the Apocalypse, and recognised it as a prophetic book (§ 6, 7); and Justin's direct statement that it was written by John, one of the Apostles of Christ (*Dial.*, 81), is the more significant since his home was in Palestine, and he had learned in his wanderings to know the Alexandrian and Roman Churches as also that of Asia Minor in which the book had its origin, equally well, and therefore represented the universal tradition of the Church of the 2nd century. As a matter of fact we know of no other tradition respecting the book. Irenæus of Lyons, who is able to appeal for the true reading of the number of the Beast to the testimony of those who had seen John face to face (*adv. Hær.*, V. 30, 1); Clement of Alexandria and the North African Tertullian (§ 9, 6); the Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 2) and Origen (§ 10, 7) ascribe it to the Apostle. It was only after Dionysius of Alexandria that doubts of the Apocalypse cropped up in the Church (§ 11, 1).[2] His view,

[1] The fact that the Apostles are spoken of quite objectively in xviii. 20, which is said to imply that they were dead, cannot possibly prove anything against the Apostolic composition, since the prophets, from whose number the author can by no means exclude himself, are quite as objectively spoken of in the immediate context. The appearance of their names on the foundation-stones of the heavenly Jerusalem (xxi. 14), only gives expression to the fact that the Church is founded on Apostolic preaching, and has a sufficient parallel in the way in which the Apostles are (in 1 Cor. xii. 28) characterized as the pre-eminent gift-bearers whom God has given to the Church (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10). The four-and-twenty Elders who stand round the throne of God (Apoc. iv. 4), are by no means the Patriarchs and Apostles in person, but the ideal representatives of the Old and New Testament Churches of God.

[2] The arbitrary criticism of the Antimontanist Alogi (Epiph., *Hær.*,

supported by the authority of Eusebius who was also a decided antimillenarian and ascribed the Apocalypse still more confidently to the Presbyter John, gained such influence in wide circles of the East that the book was refused admission into the Canon then in process of formation; on the other hand the West never doubted its apostolicity and canonicity, and the East also gradually overcame its doubts. But the whole history of criticism shows that what gave rise to the authenticity of the book being disputed, was, as in the early Church, in some cases antipathy to its contents and in others a partiality in favour of the other Johannine books, whose genuineness it was thought impossible to maintain if the Apocalypse were apostolic, until at last it has been deemed impossible to dispute the residence of the Apostle at Ephesus, for which the testimony of the Apocalypse is decisive, unless the Apocalypse together with the other Johannine writings be declared non-apostolic.

If the Apocalypse, on Luther's and Carlstadt's authority, was for a long time reckoned among the Apocryphal writings of the New Testament in the Lutheran Church of the 16th century (§ 12, 6), yet Luther made no secret whatever of the fact that he could not reconcile himself to the book, and could find no indication that it was prompted by the Holy Ghost (*Vorr. v.* 1522); whereas Melanchthon employed it without hesitation. Zwingli also ascribed the Apocalypse to another John, while

---

51), to which Dionysius of Alexandria (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 7, 25) probably refers, only proves their utter incapacity to understand the book; and is already discredited by the fact that they ascribe it to Cerinthus. That this was done also by the Roman presbyter Caius and that he entirely rejected the Apocalypse, is quite improbable (comp. § 10, 4). Its absence from the Syriac Church-Bible affords no presumption against its Apostolic authorship (§ 10, 1). It was perhaps not merely Dionysius' dislike of the support it gave to the Millenarianism he opposed that influenced him against it; but in any case his criticism set out with the assumption that the fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles proceeded from the Apostle, and because it differed from these, he concluded that it was spurious, whereas the Apocalypse is unquestionably earlier attested than those later works, and is incomparably more in keeping with the historical figure of the Apostle. He was unable to appeal to a different tradition respecting its origin.

Calvin used it as apostolic and canonical. Theod. Beza defended it against Erasmus who was the first to draw attention once more to the doubts of ecclesiastical antiquity respecting it; while Bullinger vindicated it against the objections of Luther; John Gerhard expended great learning in the defence of its apostolicity, to which the Arminians and Socinians also adhered. After a work (by F. Abauzit: *Discourse Hist. and Crit. on the Revelation*, London, 1730) put forth anonymously had again stirred up the question and called forth some rejoinders, a violent controversy regarding the Apocalypse was excited in Germany by Oeder's book, *Christlich-freie Untersuchung uber die sogen. Offenb. Joh.*, edited by Semler in 1769, which after the manner of the old Antimontanists once more declared it to be a work of Cerinthus foisted on John (comp. especially the *Apologies for the Apocalypse*, by Hartwig and Storr, 1780, 83). J. D. Michaelis did not venture on a decision respecting its authorship; but the idea of the fanatical and heretical character of the book was gradually abandoned by Merkel and Corrodi even on the rationalistic side, Herder and Eichhorn again leading the way to an appreciation of its æsthetic value; since whose time the proof of its apostolicity has been looked upon as newly confirmed. It was in the school of Schleiermacher that the criticism of Dionysius was again taken up in favour of the fourth Gospel, the position being adhered to that only the Gospel *or* the Apocalypse can proceed from John.[3] Setting out with the same dilemma, and returning to the criticism of Semler, but distorting it in the interest of its construction of history, the Tübingen school made this very book, which it interpreted as crassly Judaistic and anti-Pauline, the most genuine monument of primitive apostolic Jewish Christianity; and on the presumption of its genuineness rejected the fourth Gospel. Volkmar alone, in his Commentary (1862), represents the Apocalypse as having been composed in the spirit of John by an anti-Pauline writer. It is only those critics who contest the Ephesian residence of the Apostle who can refuse to acknowledge his authorship of a book that manifestly had its origin in Asia Minor, in which case it is of very little importance whether with Scholten we hold that the author wishes to be taken for the Apostle

---

[3] Thus the Apocalypse was ascribed by Lücke (*Versuch einer vollst. Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.*, Bonn, 1832, 2 Aufl., 1852) and Neander to another John; by Credner, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek (*Vorl. über die Apoc.*, Berlin, 1862), Düsterdieck (in Meyer's *Komm.*, 3 Aufl., 1877), Wieseler (*zur Gesch. der NTl. Schriften*, Leipzig, 1880), Schenkel, Mangold and most others to the Presbyter John; and in one solitary instance to John Mark (Hitzig, *über Joh. Marc. u. s. Schriften*, Zürich, 1843, whom Weisse followed). For mediating views, according to which it was another John who wrote, or the Presbyter under the authority of the Apostle, comp. Renan and Grau.

or not. But even on this supposition, the fact that the book has been ascribed to the Apostle since the time of Justin is in favour of his being connected with the Church of Asia Minor, as the Apocalyptic writer indisputably claims to be. On the other hand the axiom which has been regarded by criticism as decisive since Dionysius of Alexandria, viz. that only the Gospel *or* the Apocalypse can proceed from the Apostle, was first shaken by Hase (*die Tübinger Schule*, Leipzig, 1855); and even apart from those who adhere as a matter of course to universal tradition respecting the Johannine writings, it has by many been fully contested. Compare Elliott, *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, London, 1851; Niermayer, *Verhandeling over de Echtheid der Joh.-Schr.*, Gravenhagen, 1852; and in addition Lechler, in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1856; Böhmer, *über Verf. u. Abfassungszeit der joh. Ap.*, Halle, 1855; Gebhardt, *Lehrbegriff der Apokalypse*, Gotha, 1873.

4. The first direct witness for the abode of the Apostle John in Asia Minor is Irenæus of Lyons, who was equally familiar with the Churches of Asia Minor and of Rome, and who expressly says that John remained with the Church at Ephesus until the time of Trajan (*adv. Hær.*, III. 3, 4). For this he appeals directly to the testimony of those presbyters of Asia Minor who had formerly been conversant with John the disciple of the Lord (III. 22, 5), as also in the same passage for his inference (incorrect however) from John viii. 57 respecting the age of Jesus, and in V. 30, 1 for the correct reading of Apoc. xiii. 18, as in V. 33, 3 f. for a prophecy of Christ respecting the glory of the finished kingdom of God, which Papias too is said to have confirmed in his exegesis. He also puts the composition of the fourth Gospel by the Apostle in the time of his stay in Asia Minor (III. 1, 1), and therefore indirectly the epistles of the same author with which he was acquainted. Hence Irenæus must not only have misunderstood what he had heard from Polycarp respecting his intercourse with John (comp. No. 2), but must also have misunderstood all the presbyters of Asia Minor, if he erroneously referred what he had been told of the Ephesian Presbyter John to the Apostle, as he is accused of doing by those who contest the Apostle's abode in Asia Minor;

although he knew, at least from the writing of Papias, with which he was familiar, that besides the Apostle there had been another Presbyter John in Ephesus.[1] But the account of Irenæus is by no means so solitary that it can rest on an individual misunderstanding. For Polycrates of Ephesus, who even in manhood was associated with Polycarp, and of whose relatives seven were bishops in Asia Minor, in an official writing to the Roman bishop Victor names John who lay on the Lord's breast along with the Apostle Philip among the pillars of the Church of Asia Minor, and states that he was buried in Ephesus (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 24).[2]

[1] If Irenæus in writing to Florinus, the companion of his youth, and the Roman bishop Victor, could appeal to Polycarp's references to John in cases where such appeal could have no meaning unless this John were the Apostle, though both might have known even from other sources with what John Polycarp had been connected; he must at least on this occasion have been enlightened as to his error. Attention has, it is true, been drawn to the fact that according to Eusebius Irenæus did actually err in making Papias, who was only a disciple of the Presbyter John, an ἀκούστης of the Apostle. But we have seen that Irenæus was probably right here, in opposition to Eusebius (No. 2); and in any case the statement is not due to a confusion of the two Johns; but if it is a mistake, it arose simply from the circumstance that Irenæus assumed that because the Johannine prophecy which he himself, according to *adv. Hær.*, V. 33, 3 f., had received from apostolic disciples, had already been imparted by Papias, he must have received it directly from the mouth of the Apostle. It would indeed have been more suspicious if he had erroneously traced back this prophecy as well as the whole Apocalypse to the Apostle John instead of the Presbyter in question, as, for example, Steitz holds; but this opinion rests on a gross misunderstanding of the prophecy in question, and on a view with regard to the author of the Apocalypse which makes the testimony of Justin impossible (No. 3).

[2] When he describes him as wearing the metal plate (τὸ πέταλον) of the high priest on his forehead, he plainly intends to intimate the high position of chief pastor occupied by John in Asia Minor; but when he calls him μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος, this points to the Apocalyptic writer and the author of the Johannine Epistles just as the ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών points to the Evangelist (comp. John xiii. 25). Appeal has, it is true, been made to the fact that Polycrates confounds the Apostle Philip, alleged to have been buried in Hierapolis, to judge from what he tells of his daughters, with Philip the Evangelist (Acts xxi. 8 f.). But apart from the circumstance that what is narrated of the daughters of

Even if it be said that the tradition of Asia Minor had an interest in identifying the Presbyter John with the Apostle, in order to raise the Churches of that place to apostolic rank, which however they undoubtedly possessed already through Paul, yet the view of the Apostle's activity in Asia Minor was also shared by Alexandrian tradition at a time when a high value was already attached to the apostolic origin of Churches, and when therefore each Church was more likely to claim this for itself than for others. Moreover Clement of Alexandria in his work *Quis Dives Salvus*, relates the history of the youth who was lost and found again, which he expressly characterizes as well attested, and which assumes that Ephesus was the proper abode of John. So too Apollonius, in a polemic against the Montanists, appeals to John the Apocalyptic writer, and tells of his having raised a person from the dead in Ephesus (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 5, 18).[3]

5. The idea of the Apostle's banishment to the island of Patmos, which unquestionably arose from a false apprehension of Apoc. i. 9 (comp. i. 2), first appears in Clement and Origen of Alexandria.[1] The former begins his narrative of

both is by no means consistent, and that the confusion may just as well be on Luke's side, since Clement of Alexandria also speaks of the Apostle Philip and his daughters (*Strom.*, 3, 6); it is quite a different thing for Polycrates to make what is told of the daughters of one Philip refer to the Apostle, and for him to have regarded the Presbyter John who was buried in his home as the Apostle of that name.

[3] If, according to the ingenious conjecture of Steitz, this narrative is nothing more than the mythical echo of the account of the saved youth of whom we read in Clement, *τέθνηκεν . τίνα θάνατον; θεῷ τέθνηκεν*, and whose conversion is described as a *τρόπαιον ἀναστάσεως*; the tradition that could have been so distorted by myth already in the years 70–80 in which time Apollonius wrote, must reach far back into the time of Polycarp and the contemporaries of John. In any case it was as much a matter of indifference to Clement where the scene of his story was laid as of what John it was told, so that a confusion of names is here absolutely precluded.

[1] Hegesippus, who, according to Eusebius, *H. E.*, 3, 20, told of the persecution of the Church under Domitian, cannot have known of a banishment of John, nor can his designation as *μάρτυς* in Polycrates (No.

the rescued youth by saying that John τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος had returned to Ephesus from the island of Patmos, although this has nothing whatever to do with the narrative itself; and the latter says that, according to tradition, the Roman Emperor had banished him to Patmos (on Matt. xvi. 6). But when he appeals to the Apoc. i. 9 in support of his statement, and expressly adds that John does not name the emperor by whom he was condemned, it is clear that the whole alleged παράδοσις has its origin in this passage of the Apocalypse. Clement is naturally as ignorant of the name of the τύραννος as Origen; but he is undoubtedly in favour of Nero rather than Domitian. Tertullian too, according to *Scorp.*, 15, certainly refers the "relegatio in insulam," of which he speaks in *De Præscr. Hær.*, 36, to the time of Nero, and was already understood in this sense by Hieron., *adv. Jovin.*, 1, 26.[2] The later assertion, that it was Domitian who banished him, manifestly rests only on the erroneous (comp. § 35, 4) view of Irenæus, that the Apocalypse was seen under Domitian (*adv. Hær.*, V. 30, 3); and was also favoured by the fact that banishments did actually take place under Domitian (*Dio Cass.*, 67, 14; 68, 1); but it never acquired exclusive predominance.[3] Whether the statement of Irenæus that John lived to the time of Trajan is indirectly confirmed

4, note 2) refer to his martyrdom. Irenæus tells nothing of it; nor does Hippolytus, although the latter mentions that John saw the revelation in Patmos (*De Christo et Antichr.*, 36).

[2] At all events he transfers the sentence of exile to Rome, of which in the former passage he says that there "apostolus Johannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur." The legend of the boiling oil which he connects with it is like that of the poisoned cup which he is said to have drunk (Augustine, *De Sanctis*, Serm. 7), almost certainly taken from Matt. xx. 22 f. (Mark x. 38 f.; comp. xvi. 18), where reference is made to the baptism with which he is to be baptized, and to the cup of which he is to drink.

[3] Victorin v. Petav. goes back to Irenæus when, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse, he says that John, when he saw it, "erat in insula Patmos, in metallum damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare;" and Eusebius, *H. E.*, 3, 18, expressly refers to him for the fact that John was banished by

by Hegesippus is very doubtful ;[4] the anecdote handed down by Polycarp is more in its favour, for it assumes that John was still living at the time of Cerinthus (comp. No. 2). In itself, however, it is quite credible, and has at all events not been shaken by the latest attempts to impute to him an early death.[5]

Domitian (comp. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 9), though quite erroneously, since Irenæus knows nothing of a banishment of John. In the same way Eusebius has probably Clement of Alexandria in his mind when he says in 3, 20 that John, according to ancient tradition, only returned to Ephesus under Nerva, although Clement never mentions the emperor. On the other hand Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 51, 12, 33) puts the Patmos exile as early as the time of the Emperor Claudius, Dorotheus of Tyre under Trajan, while Theophylact wavers between Nero and Trajan. Notwithstanding all this, the exile in Patmos has been defended as historical by the adherents of collective tradition, of late also by L. Schulze and by Keil (in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 1881).

[4] When Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 32) says that, according to Hegesippus, the Church remained a pure and spotless virgin until the time of Trajan, that it was only when ὁ ἱερὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων χόρος had in various ways ended their lives and the generation of eye-witnesses had died out that the delusion of false doctrine had arisen and come forth without disguise because there was no longer an Apostle alive, it seems to follow that at least up to this time *one* Apostle was still alive. But from the words of Hegesippus actually quoted in 4, 22, it only appears that he describes the Church (perhaps only that of Jerusalem) as a virgin down to the time of the Bishop Simeon (who suffered martyrdom under Trajan), because it had not yet been corrupted by false doctrine; so that Eusebius, who, following Irenæus, put his death in the *Chronicon* at about 100, might have been led to add the dying out of the Apostles as a reason. Epiphanius quite arbitrarily makes the Apostle reach the age of 94, Chrysostom of 120.

[5] It is clear from No. 3, note 1 that Apoc. xviii. 20, xxi. 14 do not prove that all the Apostles were already dead at that time ; nor is more proved by the notice in the Chronicle of Georgios Hamartolos of the 9th century, according to which Papias is said to have related in his exegesis that John was murdered by the Jews in fulfilment of Matt. xx. 20. For apart from the fact that we apparently have here an interchange of the two sons of Zebedee, this notice says nothing whatever with respect to the time of such martyrdom, but is rather appended to the Ephesian abode of the Apostle, who is said to have been still living there under Nerva; the martyrdom of John is moreover quite improbable, since Irenæus and Eusebius, who had themselves read Papias, know nothing of it. Respecting the alleged but equally worthless indirect testimony of Hera-

Other later accounts of John betray only too clearly their mythical origin. The touching picture in *Hieron. ad Gal.* vi. 16, according to which the old man John, when he could no longer speak much, still had himself carried to the Church-meeting and constantly repeated the words, "Little children, love one another," but when asked why he always repeated the same words, answered, "Because it is the command of the Lord, and because it is enough to keep this one commandment," bears quite the appearance of having been taken from the Epistle of John. Tertullian already describes the Apostle as *spado Christi* (*De Monog.*, 17); in the Recension of the Ignatian Epistles we read that he died ἐν ἁγνείᾳ, like the Baptist (*ad Philad.*, 4); and according to Ambrosiaster (on 2 Cor. xi. 2), he, like Paul, remained unmarried. Hence he is frequently called πάρθενος or παρθένιος (comp. Hieron., *adv. Jovin.*, 1, 26), which probably rests on a misinterpretation of Apoc. xiv. 4, unless it was assumed *à priori* that this alone was worthy of the favourite disciple of Jesus. It is only since the Nicene Council that he bears the surname ὁ θεόλογος. The expectation that he would not die (vers. 23) had its foundation in the prophecy of Jesus (John xxi. 22); and when he nevertheless died, consolation was found in the assumption that his apparent death was in truth only a sleep (comp. Hieron., *ante*), an idea which was afterwards more and more embellished in a legendary form (comp. August. in *Ev. Joh.*, tract. 124).

§ 34. The Composition of the Apocalypse.

1. The λόγοι προφητείας of this book, like all prophecy, have a hortatory and consolatory purpose; they are intended to be kept (i. 3; xxii. 7); they are meant for the strengthening of patience and faith (xiii. 9 f.; xiv. 12 f.), to give comfort and courage by their promises (xix. 9; xxii. 12 f.) In the seven epistles in particular (chap. ii. 3) the general substance of the book is adapted to the consolation and exhortation of readers and to their special needs. But the proper and leading aim of the book is the unveiling of the future (i. 19; iv. 1; xxii. 6); a particular inscription characterizes it as an ἀποκάλυψις effected by Jesus Christ (i. 1 ff.).[1] In so far it adheres more to the later prophets,

cleon for the martyrdom of the Apostle (ap. Clem., *Strom.*, 4, 9) comp. Grimm, *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theol.*, 1874, 1.

[1] This expression has nothing whatever to do with the designation of

as Ezekiel, Zechariah and Daniel (comp. ii. 19 : τῷ Δανιὴλ ἐν ὁράματι τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ μυστήριον ἀπεκαλύφθη), without intending by this self-designation to imply a characteristic difference from earlier prophecy. Just as the latter invariably conceives of the final consummation as immediately connected with the present, whether as a consequence of the conversion to which it calls the nation, or as a consequence of the judgments which it announces to the unrepentant people, so it is in the present book. Its only purpose is to make known what will shortly happen (ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει, i. 1 ; xxii. 6) ; the time when these things shall be fulfilled is at hand (ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς, i. 3 ; xxii. 10).[2] It rests on the presumption, common to the whole New Testament, that the second coming of the Lord, and with it the final consummation, is at hand (ἰδού, ἔρχομαι ταχύ, xxii. 7, 12, 20). Like all Biblical prophecy, it is not a prediction simply of future events, but it promises the fulfilment of the Divine decrees of salvation regarding the future consummation, the way to which is

the second coming of Christ as an ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησ. Χριστ. (1 Cor. i. 7). So too the later designation of the book as ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου only denotes that it was an unveiling by John of the secrets of the future. Christ's second coming, in the sense in which the synoptical discourses of Jesus and the apostolic preaching announce it, by no means forms the proper substance of the book.

[2] For this reason early ecclesiastical exegesis, which regarded the Apocalypse as a description, veiled in enigmatical symbols, of a series of world- and Church-historical events extending over hundreds and thousands of years (comp. Elliott, *Horæ Apoc.*, London, 1851), contradicts the most definite utterances of the book itself. The principle of this false exposition is not, however, overcome in the so-called imperial-historical interpretation which finds in it not indeed the prediction of separate events, but a representation of the great phases of development and of the potencies directing the history of the Church and its relation to the kingdoms of the world (comp. Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenb. Joh.*, Basel, 1854 ; 3 Aufl., 1874, as also the Commentaries of Hengstenberg, 1849–51, 1862, and Ebrard, 1853) ; nor is it got rid of in the final-historical interpretation founded by Hofmann in *Weissagung und Erfüllung* and in his *Schriftbeweis*, which entirely severs the history of the last time said to be described in it, from the author's present (comp. the commentaries of Kliefoth, 1874, and Füller, 1874).

already prepared and pointed out in the present. In so far, the Apocalypse can only be explained from the history of the time, as the form in which it looks for the commencement of such fulfilment is necessarily conditioned by the relations of its present, and therefore cannot be understood without a vivid realisation of the relations of the time amid which it was written.[3] Its only peculiar characteristic is that it expressly treats of the events which must take place before the final consummation can begin; a thing already found in the eschatological prophecy of Christ (Matt. xxiv.) and in Paul (2 Thess. ii.; comp. § 17, 7). For just as certainly as it is an act of God that brings about the final consummation, so certainly can this, because it is associated with the last judgment, only enter in when all has happened that can and must happen in order to bring the world to repentance; and when the power that is hostile to God has risen to the highest summit of evil. The Apocalypse must therefore seek to interpret the signs of the time, that is to say, it must look at the phenomena of the time in their relation to the kingdom of God, and unravel the laws of a divinely appointed development which even in them are in process of fulfilment; whence we see what phases it still has to go through in order to reach the climax at which the world has become ripe for judgment. From the religious point of view it is a kind of philosophy of history to which

[3] This view of the Apocalypse, supported by Ewald, Lücke, de Wette, Bleek, and Düsterdieck, and the only correct one, because the only one that is in keeping with the character of Biblical prophecy, is by no means to be confounded with the old rationalistic view represented by Eichhorn, Herder, and others, which regards the book either as containing only fantastic pictures of events of the time, or poetic descriptions of the victory of Christianity over Judaism and heathenism, and thus comes into touch with the old ecclesiastical allegorizing, individualizing interpretation, as also with the abstract modern imperial-historical interpretation by which the pictures are explained away; it cannot, however, be denied that the time-historical interpretation has in the course of development fallen into many of the errors of rationalism.

Apocalyptic prophecy gives birth, though not in the form of calm reflection but in imaginative intuition. Comp. Weiss, *Apokalyptische Studien* (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, 1).

It is not without justice that the Revelation of John has been classed with the Prophet Daniel and isolated kindred phenomena of Apocryphal literature (the Book of Enoch, 4 Ezra, the Sibyllines, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Ascension of Isaiah and others) under the concept of Apocalyptic Prophecy. But the way in which Lücke for example still sought to define its essence, remains uncertain in respect to individual features, such as the visionary form, the universal historical character and the pseudo-epigraphical method, which in some respects do not suit all these writings and in other respects have not been proved to be in necessary connection with their nature. It is the merit of Auberlen on the one hand and of Hilgenfeld (*die jüdische Apokalyptik*, Jena, 1857) on the other, to have attempted the latter task; but whereas the former looks on it as the most wonderful acme of prophecy given to the Church of the future, as a light for the time destitute of a revelation, the latter regards it as an imitation of old national prophecy. Thus both try to explain the peculiarities to which Lücke had previously drawn attention; the one from an unhistorical conception of inspiration, the other by a complete cancelling of the book's prophetic character.

2. The Revelation of John represents itself to be a series of visions which the Prophet saw and in which he professes to have heard many voices from heaven. What he had thus seen, he wrote down at the command of Christ (i. 11, 29). Since the seeing of visions was a form in which the prophetic gift frequently manifested itself in Apostolic times, it would be purely arbitrary to treat this statement solely as a literary fiction; the way in which the initial vision is introduced (i. 19 f.) with all details of time and place, in order that the right of the Prophet to turn to the Churches might be based on it, would in this case no longer be a mere literary fiction but an actual *pia fraus*, in which light it was in fact regarded by Eichhorn. Hence the visions which awakened and confirmed in the author the hopes with which he encourages and animates the Christendom of his time, were actually due to Divine agency.[1] On the other hand, Heng-

[1] We must not here overlook the fact that divinely wrought vision

stenberg's theory that the visions were recorded at the moment of their reception, is entirely at variance with the nature of visions; i. 9 even seems to indicate that when the seer wrote down the visions he was no longer on the island of Patmos where he received them. But it is altogether inconceivable in this case that he should have given a minute account of such a number of varied and complex visions and of them alone, as Düsterdieck supposes. On the contrary he can only have reproduced and expanded in a free literary form what had been imparted to him in such visions; nor does this at all diminish the prophetic value of the Apocalypse, for the spirit of prophecy that inspired him was by no means limited in its operation to such moments of vision.[2] Moreover an essential difference may be perceived in the visions themselves. Some are expressly assigned to being ἐν πνεύματι, *i.e.* to ecstatic vision; and

does not directly impart a knowledge absolutely supernatural, any more than other forms of revelation. Because it is and remains a psychological phenomenon, even when employed by God as a medium of His inspiration, therefore the image seen in it, and the hope it awakens, can only assume a form conditioned by the individuality of the seer and his ideas of time and nationality. It would be quite arbitrary, however, only to concede a secondary degree of prescriptive authority to the Apocalypse on account of this visionary character; or to hold exclusively to those fundamental ideas that appear elsewhere without metaphor in the Apostolic preaching, since the same thing applies to inspiration in all its forms.

[2] Only in this way can we explain the artificial plan and carrying out of the whole work, or the palpable literary dependence on Old-Testament, perhaps even Apocryphal types. Only in this way can we explain how it is that in the delineation of the visions, we meet with traits that are absolutely incompatible with the reality at least of an ecstatic visionary state (i. 12, 17; v. 4; vii. 14; x. 4, 9 f.). The author of the Apocalypse is fully conscious of this free reproduction; for the epistles he is told to write by Christ who appears to him in a vision, all conclude with the exhortation to hear what the spirit of prophecy says to the Churches (ii. 7 etc.; comp. xiv. 13); the description of the vision frequently passing directly and without intimation into prophetic discourse (xi. 4–14; xiii. 5–10, 12–17; xviii. 9–19; xx. 7–10; xxi. 24–27; xxii. 3–5).

all these, viz. the Christophany of i. 12, the Theophany of iv. 2, the apparition of the great whore in xvii. 3 and of the heavenly Jerusalem in xxi. 1, as also the σημεῖα introduced by ὤφθη in xii. 1, 3, or the forms of the living creatures in chap. xiii., apart from occasional poetic colouring, may very well be regarded in this light. On the other hand there are certainly visions that cannot at all be presented as such because deficient in all objective plasticity, such for example as many of those consisting of seals, trumpets and vials.[3] These can only be regarded more or less as literary composition; the images outlined in them being only the form in which the Apocalyptist expresses his prophetic conceptions. To such undoubtedly belong the introductory and intermediate scenes which invest the whole with such fulness of dramatic life and such wealth of poetic imagery.[4] The book must therefore be taken as a prophetic work based on visions imparted to the prophet, and yet nevertheless, as it lies before us, be treated as a free literary production.

3. The form of the *symbol* corresponds to the way in which the revelations of the Apocalypse are presented in visions. That only which from its nature is visible, can be seen; hence the ideas the seer wishes to evoke, must be embodied in symbols. The figurative language of the East and the

Lücke already perceived that many images of the Apocalypse have something extravagant and monstrous, which he attributed to the striving after the things of the next world and the super-terrestrial, and to the consideration of the world as divested of its present form. Others, as de Wette, censured the imagery as an offence against æsthetics, overlooking the fact that it aims only at symbolical significance and not at æsthetic effect. It is true, however, that many images plainly reveal the motive of their composition; and by this very means betray the mechanism of their structure, which however leads to no clear result.

[4] The prophet certainly heard heavenly voices in the visions that he saw; but here too the striking reminiscences of the Old Testament show how much of this literary matter is subordinate in the visions of the Book. In the introduction we have for example the old prophetic λέγει ὁ κύριος (i. 8); and at the conclusion words of Christ (xxii. 12–16, 20), even where no intimation is given that they were heard in a vision.

symbolism of the Old Testament worship supplied the means to this end. Any phenomenon of nature or of human life that suggests a particularly vivid image is stamped as a symbol of it; so too it is customary in the East to employ symbol in describing events that from their supersensuous or future character elude direct intuition. This symbolism, having once become necessary for the delineation of visions, passes over into the language of the Apocalyptic Epistles as poetic embellishment.[1] From a series of significant, symbolical traits, freely-formed pictures are constructed, the meaning of which can only be perceived from a combination of all these individual traits. Even such *allegorical* forms may be the plastic expression of a general idea, just as the three Apocalyptic riders of chap. vi. represent bloodshed, famine and universal death; or they may be ideal representatives of that which in reality is only conceived in its genesis or is to be condensed out of the endless diversity of aspect into unity of presentation. Thus the twenty-four elders around God's throne represent the Church as it stands before the face of God, completed from eternity, while the four living creatures represent collective creation. But these allegorical forms are usually images of terrestrial or super-terrestrial realities which are meant to be thus charac-

[1] All that is brilliant in nature, the glitter of the sun or of gold, the lustre of precious stones or of pearls becomes an emblem of the Divine glory; all that is terrible in nature, lightning and thunder, the roar of the tempest and the whirlwind, hail and earthquake, emblems of the Divine justice. The horns are symbolical of power, the eyes of omniscience, the white hair of eternity, the diadem of supremacy, garlands and palms of victory, incense of prayer. The symbolism of colours and of beasts is especially common; white is the colour of purity, fiery red is blood colour, black the colour of mourning, paleness the colour of fear; lion and lamb, eagle and serpent, dragon and beasts appear as emblems of the qualities they represent. So too the symbolic acts of sealing and unsealing, the blowing of the trumpet and the casting down of the stone, the gathering of the harvest and the pressing of the wine, are immediately intelligible.

terized according to their innermost nature.[2] The mode of presentation most characteristic of the Apocalypse is *typology*. If we assume that the Church of the New Testament is only the continuation and completion of that of the Old Testament, for which reason it always appears as the nation of the twelve tribes gathered round their king who is enthroned on Mount Zion, the history of the former is throughout a typical prophecy in relation to the destinies of the latter. Her seducer is said to be Jezebel; her specific enemy, Babylon. Hostile hosts continue to press forward from the Euphrates and assemble at Megiddo; while the final victory of the Messiah over the enemies of God is completed in a great and decisive battle. The deliverance of the primitive Church is painted in colours taken from Israel's deliverance out of Egypt; the final exhortations to Israel to repent are given through Moses and Elias whose fate seems to be modelled on that of Christ. The plagues which come upon the world, and from which believers are preserved, are copied from those of Egypt from which Israel was delivered; and withal we have the plague of locusts and that of hostile armies, but exaggerated by their demon origin in such a way as to transform all that was figurative in the prophetic deline-

[2] Many of these allegories are explained by the Apocalyptist himself, others are intended to be and are easily recognised from their significant features. The first rider in the 6th chapter, as also that of the 19th, denotes the victorious returning Messiah, the form of the Son of man in chaps. i. and xiv. the exalted Messiah, the dragon of chap. xii. Satan, the woman clothed with the sun in chap. xii. the Old Testament theocracy, the temple and its fore-court in chap. xi. believing and unbelieving Israel, the bride of the Lamb the completed Church. The two beasts in chap. xiii. are the Roman empire and the heathen false prophets, the whore is the metropolis of the world. These allegorical forms are just as much misinterpreted when regarded as representations of abstract ideas that are dissevered from the ground of reality as when they are made to refer to particular historical events; whereas their specific meaning consists in the very fact that they denote the deepest essence of a phenomenon which on this account is often unfolded in a wealth of particulars.

ation, into fearful reality. The typology of the Apocalypse culminates in the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem, in which the abode of the blessed appears as the holy city of the twelve tribes described with all the splendour of symbolism as the habitation of the Divine presence and the site of Paradise regained.[3] The Apocalypse has not indeed a symbolical, allegorical or typical meaning throughout; the gorgeous colouring, the change of scene or imagery, of heavenly forms and voices, serves in many cases only as fanciful adornment. The use of a devised number only subserves the predilection for the concrete and plastic; though the choice made has frequently a symbolical or typical meaning.[4]

[3] This typical imagery enables the Apocalyptic writer to give concrete fulness of life to those future events which he neither knows nor claims to know. He does not profess to foretell what will be, after the manner of heathen divination, but to depict the nature of it. He describes the visitations and Divine judgments familiar in the history of Israel, but always enhanced with new terrors; and portrays Israel's experiences of grace, but more glorious in repetition. To apply these images, which were only modelled after the typical pattern, to separate historical phenomena, has been the great mistake of that allegorical interpretation common to the old ecclesiastical and the rationalistic views of the Apocalypse.

[4] The author is fond of giving clearness to abstract ideas of multitude and size, smallness and shortness, the whole and its parts, by concrete numbers. A short time is now half an hour, now an hour, and again ten days (viii. 1; xvii. 12; ii. 10); a small part is a tenth part; a larger part a fourth; a still larger, a third (xi. 13; vi. 8; viii. 7 ff.). All that is Divine or represented as divinely fulfilled bears the sign of the number 7; the broken 7 ($3\frac{1}{2}$) has since Daniel been the characteristic designation of the last time of trouble, which is estimated in years, months and days; and from which, erroneously regarded as chronological, the old misconception of the Apocalypse reckoned the last day. The cosmic number is 4; 10 with its potentiality represents abundance; 12 remains the mark of the Church of God on the basis of Apocalyptic typology, and with its multiples dominates the description of the heavenly Jerusalem. So too the numerical puzzle of xiii. 18, proposed for guessing the name whose letters taken in their numerical value give the number 666, evidently interests the author by the peculiarity of this number. Strangely enough a gematrian art has been often seen in it, such as would not have been expected from a simple Apostle.

4. The Apocalypse forms an artistic whole. Just as Grotius formerly sought to reconcile the different views respecting time and place of the Apocalypse's composition by the theory that different parts were composed at different times, partly in Patmos and partly in Ephesus, so Vogel (*Comm. VII. de Apoc. Joan.*, Erl., 1811–16) attempted to reconcile the diverse opinions respecting the author by dividing the separate parts between the Apostle and Presbyter. Nor could Schleiermacher discover any connection between the different visions proceeding from different times. But after Bleek had expressly withdrawn his view that the second part was of later origin than the first (*Berl. Theol. Zeitschr.*, Bd. II.), the unity of the Apocalypse was held as fully established down to the most recent time.[1] The theory of a recapitulation originated by Tichonius and Augustine, virtually indeed gives up unity of composition in the Apocalypse. According to it the single visions have no internal connection, but only repeat in substance the same thing in another form. Vitringa has made the most consistent attempt to carry out this recapitulating parallelism (*Anacrisis Apoc. Joa.*, ap. Francof., 1705; Amstel., 1719); while Hofmann and Ebrard who divide it into four sections or visions occupy essentially the same standpoint; as does also Hengstenberg who divides it into seven groups. Eichhorn,

[1] In pursuance of a hint from Weizsäcker, Völter (*Enstehung der Apokal.*, Freiburg i. B., 1882; 2 Aufl. 1885) again attempted to find a threefold elaboration of the primitive Apocalypse of the year 65–66, to which the Apostle himself is said to have added an appendix in 68–69, made in the time of Trajan, the years 129–30 and 140. Though setting out with the correct view, that the prevailing conception of the united authorship of the Apocalypse is untenable, he has carried the dissecting scissors into verses and parts of verses and applied to the doctrine and representation of the book rules for discovering the various authors, which are by no means adapted to its rich imaginative colouring, nor yet to its eclectic use of the Old Testament or contemporary figures. The uncertain foundation of his positive assertions is however shown by the far-reaching diversities of the two editions.

after the example of Pareus (*Komm.*, 1618) and Hartwig (*Apologie der Apok.*, Chemn., 1781) declared the Apocalypse to be a drama which after a prelude (iv. 1–viii. 5) represents in three acts the victory over Judaism and Heathenism, as also the heavenly Jerusalem. But he is obliged to confess that the description of a witnessed drama is no drama whatever. The change of scenery and figures, of speech and song, of symbolical acts and events, which gives the book such dramatic power and life, is consistent with the representation of the whole in visions.[2] Since the prophet was instructed in the first vision to write down what he had seen for the seven Churches, all are virtually agreed in regarding chaps. i.–iii. as an introduction to the whole. With regard to the great majority of the visions, however, Lücke adopted the view of a certain fluctuation between pragmatically advancing and parallelizing recapitulation; while de Wette discerned two development-series, the second of which was supposed to begin with chap. xii. (according to Volkmar, with chap. x.). But Bleek, Ewald, Düsterdieck and Kliefoth (comp. also Rinck, *Apokalypt. Forschungen*, Zürich, 1853) were the first to formulate with increasing artificiality the conception that the visions might be resolved into one continuous vision; and it was only on account of the apparent impossibility of carrying out this theory that

[2] Because the book is based on actual events, Düsterdieck calls it an epic, ignoring the free elaboration that lies at the foundation of the visions (comp. No. 2); while in strange self-contradiction he compares it with Dante's Divina Commedia. Lücke was altogether in a false position when enquiring into the "literary art" of the book; for the description of visions, such as was customary with the old prophets and the Apocryphal Apocalypses, supposing that the author actually saw such visions, is not a literary art. But to say that the book was an Apostolic Epistle because the whole of it was adapted to the readers by a written introduction (i. 4–8) and conclusion (xxii. 18–21), was quite a mistake, for the very reason that it has a peculiar inscription (i. 1–3), which such Epistles never have.

doubt was again thrown on the unity of the Apocalypse (comp. Note 1).

This artificial distribution according to which the various parts of the vision only seem to lead up to the end, while new developments are again allowed to intervene, is accounted for by assuming that the object was to keep expectation as to the nearness of the end continually on the stretch, and to exercise the Christian in patient waiting. This view moreover seems to have some support in the way in which the seven trumpet-visions may be understood as unfolding themselves from the last of the seven seals. Yet the section chap. xii.–xiv. which comes between these and the seven vial-visions, is by no means a mere exposition of what follows, but goes far beyond it, especially in chap. xiv. The insoluble contradiction remains, that the end is again and again announced as coming (vi. 17; x. 6 ff.; xi. 18; xiv. 7; xix. 7) and yet as a matter of fact does not come; that the heavenly temple which the seer already beholds in viii. 3, is in ix 19, xv. 5 again opened. To say that a whole series of scenes is proleptic (as for example the 2nd half of chap. vii.; chap. xi.; chap. xiv. 14–20; xix. 1–10) is only to admit that they are just as much out of place in the representation of a development progressive in time, as are the numerous alleged intervening scenes and resting points. The change of scenery and ground, the appearing of the same persons under different images and of the same images for different persons and things in the same vision, is somewhat bewildering and out of character. This view gives the impression of a refinement of ingenuity of which the simple Apostle would justly be considered incapable, especially as set forth by Rinck who includes all in one great jubilee period, and by Ewald who elaborates a confusing play on numbers; nor has it an analogy in any Apocalyptic writing.

The very fact that the calling vision at all events forms a part by itself makes it exceedingly probable that single visions are distinct from each other in what follows. On this point the older view was indisputably right; for as a matter of fact seven visions are most clearly separated by distinct superscriptions, by introductory scenes, by change of ground and the opening of new scenery. The older view was at fault only in supposing that these visions stood side by side without any connection and contained the same thing; whereas each one in skilful gradation stretches the expectation in some point to what follows, which again com-

pletes some new particular in the development, each leading surely on until the end is actually reached, and making this itself even clearer and more definite. We do not by any means deny that this composition is closely connected with the way in which the visions had unveiled the future to the author himself with growing clearness and particularity. Comp. Weiss, *Apocalyp. Stud.* (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, 1).

5. The superscription not only denotes the substance of the book, but also tells how the author arrived at it, and urgently impresses it on the heart of the readers (i. 1–3). In the epistolary introduction the benediction is expressed in a peculiarly trinitarian form; it ends with a doxology to Christ, to which is attached as it were a motto for the whole book (i. 4–8). The *first* vision is that of the calling (i. 9–iii. 22). The exalted Christ appears to the seer as the heavenly High Priest in the midst of the seven Churches and tells him to write a letter to each of them; in which in solemn conformity judgment is pronounced on each one, promises or threats being dealt out respectively. These Epistles by their imagery point forward in many ways, especially in their promises, to the visions that follow, which the seer is to write down for all. In the *second* vision the prophet is carried away in ecstasy into heaven (iv. 1 f.) directly before the throne of God around which he hears resound the praises of the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders. On the right hand of God lies the great book of the future which no man can unseal, until the slain Lamb appears and receives it, whereupon He is greeted with songs of praise from every creature in heaven and all creation (iv. 3–v. 14). He then begins to open the seals of the book; and now follow the established starting-points already given by Christ for all prophecy respecting the future: in the first seal the promise of a victorious return; in the three following the three precursors of this return, war, hunger and pestilence, declared by Him to be the beginning of woes; in the

fifth His exhortation to the martyrs to have patience (comp. Luke xviii. 7 f.); in the sixth the signs of the heavens promised at the second coming, rightly interpreted by the inhabitants of the earth as forerunners of the great day of wrath accompanying the destruction of the world (chap. vi.). The scene that follows shows how the elect are sealed as a protection from the plagues that were to precede this destruction (vii. 1–8), and how the martyrs slain in the battles of the last great tribulation triumph in heaven (vii. 9–17). It is left to later visions to show what is meant by the plagues and tribulation. When the seventh seal is opened, and the whole contents of the book of the future are first to be revealed, there is silence in heaven for a short space of time (viii. 1). In this vision the final ending still remains completely veiled. The *third* introduces itself by a superscription of its own as the vision of the seven angels of the throne with their trumpets (viii. 2), and is ushered in by a heavenly scene, which does not take place like the second in the heavenly throne-room, but like the whole vision (comp. ix. 13) in the heavenly sanctuary before the altar of incense (viii. 3–5). The plagues announced in the former vision under an entirely different image, from which the elect are preserved, at the blast of trumpets now come upon the ungodly heathen world as a last but vain exhortation to repentance; the two great woes of the plagues of hellish locusts and of hosts of demon-riders, of the 5th and 6th trumpets, are depicted as the most terrible of God's scourges (viii. 6–ix. 21). The prophet is warned by the voices of thunder that he hears but is directed to seal up, and by the little book that he is to devour but to keep with him, that this time also he must be silent respecting the end to be ushered in with the 7th trumpet (chap. x.). Then follows the reverse side of the second woe, in which is described how, after the deliverance of the believers in Israel, unbelieving Israel is trodden under foot by the heathen during the last

tribulation, but how God sends final exhortations to repent even to them, and how in the great judgment of God that then bursts forth a remnant of Israel at least is saved (xi. 1–13). With the sounding of the 7th trumpet the last woe breaks in; but we know already from chap. x. that this is still kept secret, and only hear how the consummation that accompanies it is celebrated in heaven (xi. 14–18). In the description of the fate of the two last prophets the beast ascends for the first time from the abyss (xi. 7), and strains the expectation as to what such beast signifies.

6. This is first disclosed in the *fourth* vision which begins with the opening of the whole temple of heaven even to the heavenly holy of holies, amid voices of thunder and fearful signs of judgment (xi. 19), when the seer first approaches the concrete relations of its immediate presence. Hence the more extended introduction. We see how the Messiah is born of the Old Testament theocracy, and snatched away to heaven from the pursuit of Satan. The victory over Satan that is solemnized in heaven is thus won. The primitive Jewish-Christian Church is secured from his machinations in the wilderness for the last time of tribulation; and Satan sets out to war against the Gentile Christians (chap. xii.). To this end he fits out the two beasts, the blasphemous empire, whose deadly wound is healed, and heathen false prophecy, which now in the last time of tribulation go forth to wage war against the Church (chap. xiii.). The Lamb with His elect marches to meet him (xiv. 1–5). But the final conflict is not yet described. An angel appears with the eternal Gospel and announces the coming of judgment, another foretells the fall of Babylon with which the great judgment begins (xiv. 6–8); and imagination is again on the stretch as to the relation in which this Babylon stands to the former beast. But after fearful threats, and promises which are intended as an encouragement to stand fast in the last struggle (xiv. 9–13), the final judgment is

only depicted in symbolical imagery (xiv. 14–20). A new superscription describes the *fifth* vision as that of the seven vials of wrath (xv. 1). It is introduced by a heavenly scene (xv. 2–4) and begins with a renewed opening of the heavenly temple (xv. 5). The pouring out of the first five vials brings an aggravation of the plagues of the third vision which now appear as the ushering in of the last great judgment of wrath (xv. 6–xvi. 11, comp. xv. 1). With the 6th the Euphrates is dried up and the kings of the earth assembled for battle at Harmagedon (xvi. 12–16); expectation being once more strained as to the meaning of this last struggle. Finally the 7th ushers in the actual beginning of the end with the fall of Babylon (xvi. 17–21). In chap. xvii. desolated Babylon is shown to the seer; he learns its meaning, its relation to the beast, how it comes to be destroyed; and in chap. xviii. hears the lament of the inhabitants of the earth over it. In heaven the hallelujah announces that with its downfall the last great judgment of God has begun, and that the consummation has come (xix. 1–10). Once more the heavens open for the *sixth* vision, and now the returning Christ comes forth with his armies of angels to the final struggle and victory over the two beasts and the kings of the earth who are in league with them (xix. 11–21). After this the Devil is shut up in the bottomless pit; the earthly termination follows in the millennium, and after the last assault of the enemies we have the decisive victory over the Devil and the last judgment (chap. xx.). But prophecy cannot end with judgment; the destruction of the old world (xx. 11) necessarily requires the description of a new one in which begins the completion of salvation. The *seventh* vision also begins with a superscription indicating the new world and the heavenly Jerusalem as its subject (xxi. 1 f.). Then follows again an introductory scene (xxi. 3–8); and now for the first time the seer is caught away in ecstasy to a high mountain, from

which he sees and can describe the descent of the new Jerusalem, viz. its realization, prepared from eternity in the decrees of God (xxi. 9–xxii. 5). Then follows the hortatory and consoling conclusion of this vision, and with it of all the rest (xxii. 6–17); as also the epistolary epilogue which contains a special warning against any alteration of the book of prophecy by additions or omissions (xxii. 18–21).

7. The Apocalypse was originally written in Greek. It is true that Harenberg and Bolten have supposed a Hebrew original here also; but the fact that it was designed for Greek-speaking Churches of Asia Minor of itself refutes this theory. The author in his A and Ω (i. 8) sets out with the Greek alphabetical notation, speaks of precious stones (xxi. 19 f.), measures (vi. 6; xiv. 20) and colours (vi. 3, 8; xi. 17) by their Greek names; is fond of using compound words and adjectives for which there is no Hebrew equivalent (*σύνδουλος, μεσουράνημα, ἡμιώριον, θύϊνος, ταλαντιαῖος, τετράγωνος, ποταμοφόρητος*) and frequently follows the LXX., especially in the forms of the names. The adoption of Hebrew words like *ἀμήν* and *ἀλληλουιά* is in keeping with the solemn style of the Apocalypse: moreover they are explained (ix. 11) or stated to be Hebrew (xvi. 6). The Greek of the Apocalypse has often been said, in an exaggerated way, to contain Hebraisms and solecisms (comp. Winer, *De Solecismus qui in Apoc. inesse dicuntur*, Erlang., 1825). That the circumlocution involving the name of Jehovah which violates every linguistic rule (i. 8; iv. 8), and is freely employed as an indeclinable proper noun (i. 4), like the predicates of Christ and of Satan (i. 5; xx. 2), or the masculine use of *ἄψινθος* as the name of an *ἀστήρ* (viii. 11), is not due to a defective knowledge of Greek cases and genders, is obvious. The superfluity of expressions in repeating the substantives instead of pronouns, of pronouns themselves and of prepositions after the compound verb and entire clauses, also belong to the solemn style of the Apocalypse; the re-

markable interchange of present, preterite and future is due to the circumstance that the description of the visions frequently passes directly into prophetic discourse (No. 2). The whole style of the book is Hebraistic in its thoroughly unperiodic character, and in its simple joining of sentences by καί, the frequent want of the copula, the putting of the verb first, the αὐτός after a relative clause or at the resumption of participles, the separation of the relative and participial clauses, as in the predilection for describing the cases by prepositions. Proper Græcisms that are wanting are the gen. absol., the acc. with infin. and the infinitive with the article; attraction occurs but rarely; and the use of the singular with the neuter plural is fluctuating. On the other hand we have the double negative, the impersonal use of the 3rd person plural, and even the finer distinction of past tenses. An improper use of later Greek occurs in the careless employment of ἵνα and its connection with the future indicative, the neglect of the finer distinctions in the employment of the prepositions and in joining the cases with prepositions and verbs. What is most anomalous is the use of the participles, of participial or other appositions which in the *casus rectus* are frequently found with a *casus obliquus*, or stand quite irregularly and pass directly into relative clauses, and of the extended use of the *constructio ad sensum* in number and gender. To be sure we must not overlook the fact that the text of the Apocalypse is very uncertainly transmitted, and that many of these irregularities have manifest rhetorical grounds; but in this we see most clearly that the author does not enter into the spirit of the Greek language, that he employs a language originally foreign to him without knowing or respecting the limits of possibility in its use.

§ 35. The Historical Situation of the Apocalypse.

1. The seven Churches to which the Apocalypse is addressed (i. 11) are the Churches of Proconsular Asia, in whose capital, Ephesus, Paul had worked so long, and where, since it is placed first, the Apostle John seems to have his abode. Then follow Smyrna, situated somewhat to the north in the territory of what was formerly Ionia; Mysian Pergamus still farther to the north; then in a south-easterly line the three Lydian cities Thyatira, Sardis and Philadelphia; and finally Laodicea in Phrygia.[1] It is generally taken for granted that all these Churches must directly or indirectly be regarded as Pauline foundations; but this is by no means certain, for there were also in olden times Jewish-Christian Church-foundations in anterior Asia (1 Pet. i. 1; comp. § 15, 2; 18, 1; 25, 6); and in point of fact our book shows (comp. No. 2), that although without doubt preponderatingly Gentile-Christian, they were by no means exclusively so. The inner relations presupposed by the letters addressed to them, show their Christian life in a state of decline and thus point to the later part of the Apostolic period. Ephesus has relaxed in zealous Christian brotherly love (ii. 4); Laodicea has become lukewarm; in over-estimating its Christian position it has given up earnest striving (iii. 15 ff.); Sardis is for the most part dead, lacking vigorous proof of a Christian state (iii. 1 ff.).

[1] Church-history has indeed regarded them only as types of consecutive forms of the Church, as Vitringa held, or as being synchronous with the last days, as Hofmann held; while Ebrard seeks to unite both views, although one is as arbitrary as the other. The reason that there are seven is certainly not that there were no others in Asia Minor, since the Churches at Troas, Hierapolis and Colosse, familiar from the history of Paul, are wanting; nor that these alone stood in relation with the Apostle or required special admonition, against which the number seven so important in the book militates; but in the fact that the author chose the number seven, in conformity with its import, as representative of the whole Church for which his prophecy was designed.

These very phenomena lead to the inference that some time had elapsed since the Apostle Paul had left his former field of activity; and that the Churches had been without definite Apostolic guidance; that John therefore had not had his home in them for long. But the most suspicious thing was the appearance of apostles having a tendency to libertinism, who not only declared the eating of flesh offered to idols, but also fornication, to be permissible, and even appealed to false prophecy and the deeper Gnosis in support of their allegation (ii. 20, 24). Ephesus it is true had not suffered the Nicolaitanes as the author calls them (ii. 6), but Pergamus had tolerated them (ii. 14 f.); and in Thyatira a false prophetess with her adherents had openly carried on her mischievous seduction (ii. 20 ff., 24). Even the deadness of Sardis, according to iii. 4, seems to be connected with the influence of this tendency so fraught with danger to the soul. This is easily explained by misapprehension and abuse of the Pauline doctrine of freedom in Gentile-Christian circles, such as might readily take place after the Apostle had withdrawn from his field of work.[2] Finally the fact itself shows that a revelation, like that of this book, had become a necessity, and was urgently impressed on the

[2] Whether the name Nicolaitane was framed by the Apocalyptist himself, or refers in some way to Nicolaus (Acts vi. 5) to whom the Church Fathers traced it, we do not know. It was however incorrect to seek in the adherents of the doctrine of Balaam (ii. 15) other errorists than these. It is striking that criticism, though looking out for traces of gnosticism everywhere in the New Testament, should only recently have discovered such in ii. 24; for which reason it has identified the libertines of our book with the Carpocratians of the second century (comp. Völter). But if for the same reason an attempt has been made to put the Epistles of Jude and 2 Peter, where this phenomenon is manifestly combated, into the second century, it remains an undoubted fact that in the Gospel of Matthew, so near to our book in time (perhaps also in place), the very same libertine ἀνομία is attacked (vii. 22; xiii. 41; xxiv. 12). On the contrary the prophecy in 2 Tim. iii. 1–5 certainly points to a universal corruption of morals, though not to such as consisted essentially in libertinism.

Church for the strengthening of their faith by animating their Christian hope, causing a decline in their expectation of the second coming, such as we have already found presupposed in the Hebrew Epistle (§ 31, 3 ; 32, 2).

2. As to the external condition of the Christians, the Churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, which must have been preponderatingly Jewish-Christian, had much to suffer from the synagogue. The former, like the Churches to which the Hebrew Epistle is addressed (§ 31, 3), had been obliged to suffer slanders, loss of property and imprisonment (ii. 9 f.) ; the latter had not only borne the enmity of the synagogue with patience, but in spite of its unimportance had begun a successful mission therein (iii. 8 f.). Pergamus in particular had suffered persecution from the hands of the heathen; and during an outbreak of heathen fanaticism against the Christians, Antipas, a prominent member of the Church, had been slain (ii. 13). It seems as if here, at the seat of supreme judgment and in face of the renowned temple of Esculapius, whose altar can scarcely be intended by the *θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ*, such an offering was first required. But what stirred the mind of the author and his readers most deeply were the misfortunes that had befallen the Christian Church at Rome. The appearance of the city of the seven hills (xvii. 6) drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, and the characterization of the fearful judgment that had come upon it as a direct punishment for what it had done to the saints, apostles and prophets (xviii. 20), plainly shows the impression which the horrors of the later time of Nero, viz. the persecution of the Christians after the burning of Rome, and the martyrdom of Paul and Peter had made upon the Church. Several years however seem to have elapsed since this time, for according to vi. 10 we find an expression of impatience that the punishment for such sacrilege had not yet supervened ; but there is no doubt that the impression they produced domi-

nated the entire apocalyptic conception of the Apostle. It is no longer unbelieving Judaism, though termed a synagogue of Satan (ii. 9; iii. 9), that is the specific antichristian power of the present, from which therefore its last and highest potentiality and personification is to go forth, as Paul had formerly supposed (§ 17, 7); but the beast from the bottomless pit, which rises out of the sea (xi. 7; xiii. 1), the Roman Empire, is the chief instrument of Satan. To it applies the enigma that it was, and is not, and will be again (xvii. 8); for since the allegorical form of the beast does not denote the Roman Empire in its historical reality but applies to its antichristian essence (§ 34, 3), it may be said that it was, when the Roman Empire under Nero first revealed itself in this antichristian character; that it is not, because the present ruler had so far shown no hostility to the Christians; but that in future its whole antichristian nature would be personified in the last emperor, and thus bring on the judgment (xvii. 11).[1]

3. The apocalyptic conception of the Apostle, combined with the historical appearance of the Roman Empire, enables us to arrive at a most accurate determination of the time when he wrote. In the foreground of his historical view is the world-stirring fact that the deadly wound of the beast was healed (xiii. 3; xii. 14).[1] But since the beast received

[1] The current application of this enigma to Nero, who though dead will return from the bottomless pit as Antichrist, notwithstanding the confidence with which it is usually put forward, rests merely on incorrect exegesis; for the beast is not a Roman Emperor, but the Roman Empire collectively, and is only personified in the last of the emperors so far as in him antichristian iniquity reached its personal culmination. That the heathen Nero-tradition, in the form it assumed, gave no occasion for this alleged Christian transformation has been fully shown by Weiss (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, 1).

[1] The current application of this imagery to Nero's return from the kingdom of the dead (comp. No. 2, note 1) is quite untenable from an exegetical point of view; for Nero is not the beast, but one of its heads, and the healing of the deadly wound is not future, but has already

the deadly wound at Nero's death, with which the old Imperial Julian race became extinct; since no one had full and certain possession of the empire during the interregnum, but as it seemed unable to go back to its former state of security and thus continued to suffer from its deadly wound, the deadly wound can only have been healed by Vespasian's elevation to the throne on the 21st December, 69. For since Vespasian was supported by his son Titus, a man experienced in warfare, while a second son remained at a distance, a foundation was laid for the new Imperial Flavian dynasty, and the empire once more regained a firm footing. This agrees perfectly with the fact that five of the seven heads had already fallen (Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero), one (Vespasian) is, and the other (Titus) is not yet come (xvii. 10).[2] Attached to it is the apocalyptic calculation of the end. For since the beast, in which the four beasts of Daniel with their seven heads are included has only seven heads, the Roman Empire also according to Divine arrangement can only have seven rulers; the additional one, the eighth, is the personification of enmity to God and can only attain supremacy by ungodly means. As was so often the case in the struggles of the interregnum, a revolution breaks out in all the provinces at the same time against the seventh emperor ruling in the

happened. Whereas the last emperor in whom the antichristian nature of the beast is personified, after having received the empire of the world, at once begins the last conflict with Christ, in which he perishes (xvii. 11, 13 f.), a space of 3½ years is given to the beast with the deadly wound healed, that he may strive with the Church of God during this last time of tribulation (xiii. 5).

[2] Since the emperors of the interregnum, which Suetonius also interprets merely as a *rebellio trium principum*, cannot here be reckoned, the Apocalypse could not have been written under Galba, as Credner, Ewald, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, Gebhard, Wieseler and most others hold, that is about 68; but only in the beginning of Vespasian's reign, as Eichhorn, Lücke, Bleek, Böhmer and Düsterdieck have already perceived, therefore about the beginning of the year 70.

world's metropolis who is destined to remain only for a short time (xvii. 11); the governors of the provinces march against Rome and destroy the city (xvii. 16), the supremacy passing over to the last of the emperors who is of the seven, and in Domitian, the third of the Flavians, already stands within the seer's vision (xvii. 11); and he with his supporters begins the last great persecution of the Christians, in consequence of which judgment directly falls upon him (xvii. 12 ff.). Comp. Weiss, *Apokalyptische Studien* (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1869, 1).[3]

4. The time of the Apocalypse is also definitely fixed by the fact that according to the prophecy in chap. xi. it was manifestly written before the destruction of Jerusalem, which in xi. 1 is only anticipated.[1] It is altogether inconceivable that a partial preservation of the temple should, in most glaring contradiction with the transmitted prophecy

[3] The application of the numerical puzzle to Nero (xiii. 8), discovered almost simultaneously by Fritzsche, Benary, Hitzig and Reuss, and almost universally accepted, is highly improbable, since the book which was written in Greek for Greek readers, and computes by the Greek alphabet (i. 8) would hardly have made Hebrew forms of names and the numerical value of Hebrew letters the basis of its reckoning, which for this reason will never rightly fit in. But it falls to pieces when we consider that we have here to do with the number of the beast, which is not Nero, but the Roman Empire; the name sought being certainly not simply a proper name, but an indication of the nature characterizing such name. Of late Völter has found the name Trajanus Hadrianus in it; whereas Irenæus, taking the numerical value of the Greek letters into consideration, thought of λατεῖνος.

[1] That chap. xi. does not refer to the Christian Church, as allegorical interpreters hold, but to the city of Jerusalem as the centre of the people of Israel, is irrefutably shown by xi. 8. But even historical exegesis is at fault in finding the destruction of Jerusalem, and again only a partial destruction in xi. 13; for the judgment of God here predicted falls immediately before the 7th trumpet, viz. before the last judgment (xi. 14 ff.) and at the end of the great tribulation, during which the heathen trample the holy city under foot, while God sends it a final exhortation to repent (xi. 2) by the two prophets whose very fate shows that the Roman Empire is supreme in the holy city (xi. 7). Both however presuppose the conquest of Jerusalem, which must therefore have been previously foretold.

of Christ (Mark xiii. 2) be here foretold, which moreover would have no connection whatever with the prophecy that follows. Rather does the sanctuary in the midst of the holy city, which is preserved from destruction by being measured, refer to nothing else than believing Israel, unbelieving Israel being represented by the forecourt.[2] If the abandonment of the latter to the heathen be prophetically foretold, the conquest of the city by Titus must have been directly at hand, and was already absolutely unavoidable. This too points to the beginning of the year 70. While the deadly wound of the beast was healed with Vespasian's elevation to the throne and the last great tribulation ushered in by the re-invigorated Roman Empire was to begin for Gentile-Christendom; Israel's great tribulation, which is likewise its last time for repentance, begins with the conquest of Jerusalem. Such is the position of the Apocalypse in time. In characteristic manner it has moulded the whole picture of the future drawn by the Apocalyptist. Formerly Christendom looked for the coming of the end immediately after the catastrophe of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv. 29); now this is only the beginning of the end whose actual coming is first signalized by the destruction of Rome. With the primitive Church of Palestine, Paul still hoped for the conversion of all Israel; the seer now goes back to the old expectation of the prophets, that after all exhortations to repentance and Divine judgments, nothing but a remnant of Israel would be saved (xi. 13; comp. iii. 9).

[2] This is expressly described as the place of a priestly Church gathered about the altar of incense; and xii. 6, 14 clearly shows that the Church in question was preserved (by flight to Pella) in the great time of tribulation. That it was already separated from unbelieving Israel is shown by the way in which the sanctuary is to be measured, though not the forecourt; but that the fate of unbelieving Israel is not yet accomplished is clear from the ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν, as well as from the fact that the treading of the holy city under foot is still future. The ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν can therefore only be applied to the thing completed in the counsels of God.

It is manifestly an error when in opposition to this clear testimony of the Apocalyse itself, Irenæus (*adv. Hær.*, V. 30, 3) says that the Apocalypse was seen towards the end of Domitian's reign. But even ecclesiastical antiquity did not hold to this view, as we see from the various times attributed to the alleged exile of Patmos (§ 33, 5, esp. note 3). Epiphanius' view that John prophesied at the time of the Emperor Claudius was adopted by Grotius and Hammond; and an old Syriac translation of the Apocalypse puts it in the reign of Nero (*ap. Lud. de Dieu*). Nevertheless the view of Irenæus holds good as the traditional one,[3] though in reality it is no tradition, but like all later views an exegetical combination which probably rests on a correct remembrance of the original sense of the Apocalypse. For it does actually apply to Domitian, inasmuch as it looks for Antichrist in him (No. 3); but Irenæus in accordance with his view of prophecy could only interpret it as having been written in his reign, unless John were made a false prophet.

5. It follows therefore that in the beginning of the year 70 John had not yet been settled in Asia Minor for any length of time. It was not to escape from persecution that he had gone to Patmos as Hilgenfeld maintains, but in order to receive a promised revelation (i. 9); and what he there saw he earnestly impressed on the Churches with whose needs he had but just become acquainted, by means of exhortation and warning, threat and promise. The very fact that after Paul's death one of the primitive apostles had made his field of labour that was preponderatingly Jewish-Christian, the scene of his own activity, manifestly excludes the view that the primitive apostles were and continued hostile to Paul and his Gentile mission. The Tübingen school

[3] It is defended as such by Hug and Ebrard, Hofmann and Hengstenberg, Lange, Kliefoth and others, and even by Schleiermacher; whereas it is given up by traditionalists themselves, like Guericke and Thiersch, who put it under Galba (No. 3, note 2). The worthlessness of the grounds on which Hengstenberg defends it, is sufficiently shown by his assertion that imprisonments (xiii. 10) first took place under Domitian (comp. on the other hand Heb. x. 34; xiii. 3), as also that the self-deification of Cæsarism points to his time; whereas Cæsar and Claudius were already received among the gods, while altars were erected to Augustus and Caligula; the assumption of the title of Augustus (σεβαστός) being evidently regarded by the author as blasphemy (xiii. 1).

it is true holds that John could only have entered into the Pauline sphere of work with the object of reforming his free Churches in a Judaistic sense; but the whole doctrinal view of the Apocalypse is at variance with such an idea. The present Church of God is taken from all nations (v. 9; vii. 9; xiv. 3). After the type of that of the Old Testament it is still made to consist of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel whose heavenly king is throned in Zion (vii. 3–8; xiv. 1 ff.); but the empirical Jerusalem has become a Sodom and Egypt by the murder of the Messiah (xi. 8); the Christian-persecuting synagogue has become a synagogue of Satan (ii. 9; iii. 9).[1] That the Apostle desires to incorporate those gained from among the heathen with the Jewish-Christian Church by making them subject to the law is directly excluded by ii. 24 (comp. Acts xv. 28).[2] It is arbitrary to assume that the works, which with piety are a mark of the true servant of God, are those legal works attacked by Paul; for the commandments of God which are required to be kept (xii. 17; xiv. 12) are identical with the word and work of Christ (iii. 8, 10; ii. 26), as also with the words

[1] The idea that empirical Jerusalem still forms the centre of the Christian Church even in the millennium, entirely mistakes the typical character of such traits as xiv. 20; xvi. 12, 16; xx. 9 (comp. § 34, 3). That the 144,000 were Christians who had formerly been Jews is impossible, for the reason that at that time there were no longer 12 tribes from each of which 12,000 could have been chosen, so that these can only have a figurative meaning. Moreover the Messiah who goes forth with them to battle (xiv. 1–5) fights with the beast, through whom, according to xii. 17, the dragon is to attack Christians from among the heathen (comp. xiii. 7). The primitive Church has already been separated from Israel and has escaped to her place of concealment (xi. 1; xii. 6, 14).

[2] It is certain, moreover, that the Apostle, departing in this respect from the freer Pauline view, holds the eating of flesh offered to idols as a defilement with heathen practices on a par with fornication (ii. 14, 20, comp. § 14, 4); but it by no means appears that it was his wish to introduce this view first into Asia Minor. It seems much more likely that it was directed against the custom prevailing there, to which the principles laid down in 1 Cor. viii. 10 might easily have led.

of this book (i. 3; xxii. 7, 9). Hence they can only be the commandments of God made known by Christ, in which He fulfilled and taught the way of fulfilling the law (Matt. v. 17), but which according to the epistles (chaps. ii., iii.) always presuppose μετάνοια, and therefore do not enjoin the external works of the law.[3] The view that the Apocalyptic writer combated Paul and his adherents under the name of Nicolaitanes is excluded by the simple fact that Paulinism in Asia Minor was not a party but the prevailing tendency; and that Paul condemned fornication no less strongly than he. And to suppose that by the apostles who are not what they profess to be (ii. 2) he meant Paul, and that in xxi. 14 he intended to exclude him from the apostolate, is to mistake the meaning of this figure (§ 33, 3, note 1), which in accordance with the entire typical character of the delineation made it impossible to represent any but the Apostles chosen for the twelve tribes as foundation-stones of the heavenly Jerusalem. The Apocalypse is just as far from advocating a carnal chiliasm as it is from Judaistic anti-Paulinism. The expectation of an earthly consummation (in the thousand years' reign) was a natural consequence of the view that the Roman Empire was the real anti-Christian power, after the fall of which nothing more stood in the way of Christ's earthly victory; but the highest promise given is only that the priestly calling of Israel should now pass over to the Church of Christ (xx. 6) to effect the salvation of all the nations of the world. It is only by mistaking the figurative character of the description of the heavenly Jerusalem that it can be regarded as a revelling in sensuous expectations. It cannot be stated more clearly than is here done that the final heavenly consummation consists in nothing but an eternal life of perfect communion with God, in which the

[3] Just as little does xiv. 4 f. refer to the requirement of abstinence from sexual intercourse, since the juxtaposition of truth shows that we have here only to do with purity from sins of the flesh.

blessed enjoying a state of completed holiness see God. Nor does anything that is said of the final destiny of the enemies of God go beyond the type of that which the whole New Testament teaches of the judgment of an angry God, condemning those who have fallen into corruption to exclusion from salvation and therefore to eternal torment.

6. A book like the Apocalypse cannot possibly, in accordance with its substance and aim, be meant to develop the author's entire Christian view of doctrine in all aspects. So much however is certain, that whereas the worship of angels is strictly forbidden (xix. 10; xx. 9), the exalted Christ invariably appears in fulness and equality of glory with God, being extolled and worshipped as God. He also appears as the Ancient of Days (Dan. vii. 9), as having existed from eternity (i. 14; comp. i. 17; ii. 8; xxii. 13), as ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως (iii. 14), and therefore of Divine substance from the beginning. As in the Hebrew Epistle, He is the heavenly High Priest (i. 13); and He stands in the centre of the Apocalyptic conception as the slain Lamb (comp. Isa. liii. 7) who by His blood has cleansed His people from the stains of guilt (vii. 14; xxii. 14) and redeemed them from the power of Satan (i. 5; v. 9; xiv. 3). That faith in Jesus, proved by the confession of His name (xiv. 12; comp. iii. 8), is to be kept in patience and fidelity, especially in the struggle with temptation to apostasy, lies in the whole situation and design of the book. And since the love of Christ is the foundation of all salvation and of the life of grace (i. 5; iii. 9), His efficacy alone supplying the deficiencies of the latter (iii. 18 f.), such life already appears as a constant communion with Him (iii. 20). Just as it is the grace of God from which all salvation is derived, and whose constant presence is invoked for the readers (i. 4; xxii. 21); so the accomplishment of salvation appears as a free gift of God (xxi. 6; xxii. 17), who already before the creation of the world has written the names of those who are called and

chosen (xvii. 14) in the book of life (xiii. 8; xvii. 8; xxi. 7). Hence this memorial of primitive apostolic Jewish Christianity, recognised as such by the Tübingen school, is a striking proof of the fact that this type of Christianity was capable of a no less rich and deep development of the Christian doctrine of salvation than Paulinism, though coloured in many peculiar ways.[1]

[1] That the author was acquainted with the Pauline Epistles is only made probable by assuming that the introductory and concluding benediction (i. 4; xvii. 21) are copied from them, whereas it is by no means certain that this Christian epistolary form is a Pauline creation (§ 16, 4, note 1). Nothing that Holtzmann has recently enumerated contains any proof whatever, for the only thing of real importance adduced, viz. the predicates of Christ, Apoc. i. 5; iii. 14 (comp. Col. i. 15, 18), is hardly exclusive Pauline property, as the Epistle to the Hebrews shows.

THIRD DIVISION.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

§ 36. The Brethren of Jesus.

1. In the Gospel of Mark, in company with Jesus' mother we hear of His brethren, who are evidently regarded as sons of Mary and Joseph (iii. 31); while in Nazareth Jesus is spoken of as the brother of four men who were well known there, called James, Joses, Juda and Simon (vi. 3). Even the Gospels which tell of the supernatural generation of Jesus assume as a matter of course that Joseph's marriage with Mary was a real marriage (Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7); and therefore they certainly looked on the brethren in question as true sons of Mary.[1] Though the scene narrated in Mark iii. 31–35 (comp. v. 21) does not by any means indicate an estrangement from Jesus on the part of His relatives or any hostility towards Him, since no definite persons are in the oldest account (Luke viii. 19–21) placed in opposition to them as His true (spiritual) relatives, yet it certainly shows that they had not joined the circle of Jesus' inquiring followers, much less that they belonged to the Apostles (Matt.

[1] The fact that conjugal intercourse between Joseph and Mary, naturally implied in the taking home of his wife, is in Matt. i. 25 expressly excluded until the birth of Jesus, is meant to show that Joseph took Mary home not in order to begin married life with her, but in order to fulfil the command of God, who desired that the Son of Mary should be born of the race of David, that He might inherit its promises. It is hereby undoubtedly implied that after the birth of the Son the carnal intercourse prohibited up to this time did actually take place. The fact that Luke calls Jesus the firstborn Son of Mary (ii. 7) at a time when it must have been already known whether she had afterwards given birth to others or not, clearly presupposes that such was the case.

xii. 46–50), from whom they are still distinguished in Matt. xxviii. 7, 10.[2] But after the resurrection of Jesus, who had appeared specially to James (1 Cor. xv. 7), they must have become believers, for the Eleven appear from the first in close connection with the mother of Jesus and His brethren (Acts i. 14); Paul enumerates them along with the Apostles as having power to take a wife with them on their missionary journeys (1 Cor. ix. 5). James, who is named first in Mark, and was therefore probably the eldest of the brethren, appears as their natural head when Peter was prevented by his imprisonment from superintending the primitive Church at Jerusalem. Peter sends word of his release to him and to the brethren (Acts xii. 17); and it is his word that is decisive at the so-called Apostolic Council (Acts xv. 13–21); Paul puts him in the first rank with Cephas and John as a pillar of the Church (Gal. ii. 9), in which, moreover, he appears as the highest authority (*τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου*, ii. 12). When Paul comes to Jerusalem for the last time, he goes to James, with whom the elders of the Church assemble (Acts xxi. 18).[3] Of this James, Josephus relates that he was condemned by the high priest Ananus to be stoned, who took

[2] In John's Gospel also the brethren are distinguished from the believing followers of Jesus with whom He appears in Cana (ii. 12), and are afterwards characterized as unbelieving in express opposition to the Twelve (vi. 67 ff.), because they made their faith in His Messiahship dependent on the carrying out of His Messianic calling in the sense of popular expectation; in behalf of which they tried to compel Him to come forward openly at the Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 3–5). Even at the cross Jesus regards them as standing so far aloof from Him and His cause that He confides His mother not to them but to His favourite disciple for protection and support (xix. 26 f.).

[3] Even in Gal. i. 19 Paul speaks of him beside Cephas in a way that in a certain sense puts him on a par with the Apostles; and in 1 Cor. xv. 7 he is directly included among the *ἀπόστολοι πάντες*. Whether this was justified in his eyes by the fact that a special appearance of the Risen One, such as that on which he himself based his apostleship, had been vouchsafed to James (1 Cor. ix. 1), or solely by his important position in Jerusalem, must remain uncertain.

advantage for this purpose of the interregnum after Festus's death, before the new governor Albinus had arrived in Judea (A.D. 62). The indignation said to have arisen on this account and which afterwards led to the deposition of Ananus, shows that this James was held in high repute even among his unbelieving countrymen (*Antiq.*, XX. 9, 1).[4]

2. A consciousness that these brethren of Jesus, in particular James, were distinct from the Apostles, was long retained in the Church. Hegesippus speaks of James, the Lord's brother who is said to have borne the surname of *the Just* throughout the whole nation, along with the Apostles, and mentions grandsons of Judas, who was a full brother of the Lord.[1] In

[4] This passage of Josephus was already suspected by Credner, and recently by Schürer and Sieffert (in Herzog's *R.-Ency.*, VI., 1880) to be an interpolation, but has been justly defended, formerly by Neudecker and now by Volkmar (*Jesus Nazarenus*, Zür., 1882). Even if the passage respecting Christ (XVIII. 3, 3) be entirely spurious, it is quite possible that he may have called this James after his famous brother (*τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ*). If the Pseudo-Clementine literature makes Peter die before James, we must remember that it is full of fictions in the interest of a tendency; and in this case it is only a question of the difference of a few years, which doubtless escaped notice. But under all circumstances so much has to be subtracted as legendary colouring from Hegesippus's account of James and his martyrdom (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 2, 23) that his statement as to its time (shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem) and manner, which Clem. of Alex. (ap. Euseb., *H. E.* 2, 1 : *ὁ κατὰ τοῦ πτερυγίου βληθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ κναφέως ξύλῳ πληγεὶς εἰς θάνατον*), simply follows, cannot be put forward as historical evidence against Josephus.

[1] He says, ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 32, *διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος*, which he accounts for in what follows by his genuine Jewish piety and constant intercession for the people. In Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 20 he tells of Domitian's search for grandsons of Judas, *τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ* (scil. *κυρίου*) *ἀδελφοῦ*. That this *λεγομένου* is not contrasted with the matter-of-fact character of the actual brotherly relation is shown by the *κατὰ σάρκα*; it is only because the unique dignity and Divine glory of the exalted Lord (*τοῦ κυρίου*) seemed to preclude the idea of brotherly relation with him, that the *λεγομένου* is added and justified by *κατὰ σάρκα*, and therefore at the same time by a common descent from Mary. The *Ἰακώβῳ τῷ λεχθέντι ἀδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου* in Clem., *Homil.*, ii. 35, may be understood in the same way.

the Jewish-Christian Pseudo-Clementines James even appears as higher in authority than the Apostles, as ἐπίσκοπος ἐπισκόπων (*Recogn.*, 1, 17. 43–59. 67. 73). Tertullian speaks of the marriage of Mary as consummated after the birth of Jesus (*De Monog.*, 8), and mentions the brethren of Jesus, whom he certainly regards as full brethren (*De Carne Chr.*, *adv. Marc.*, 19). Since he calls the author of the Epistle of Jude an Apostle (*De Cultu Fem.*, 1, 3), he did not regard him as the brother of Jesus. Clement of Alexandria says in Euseb., *H. E.*, 2, 1, that the three Apostles to whom the Lord Himself gave the preference, viz. Peter, James, and John, did not strive for the honour of becoming bishops of Jerusalem after His ascension, but that the post was conferred on James the Just, for which reason, following the precedent of Gal. ii. 9, he puts this James *before* John and Peter as one of those who had received the Gnosis from the Lord and had transmitted it to the other Apostles (comp. *Strom.*, 1, 1, 6, 8); so that he already counts James, like Paul (No. 1, note 3), an apostle in the wider sense.[2] In the Apostolic Constitutions Ἰάκωβός τε ὁ τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελφὸς καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπος καὶ Παῦλος ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος are enumerated with the Twelve as οἱ κηρύξαντες τὴν καθολικὴν διδασκαλίαν (6, 14; comp. 6, 12). In 7, 46 James calls himself a brother of the Lord after the flesh, and seems in 2, 55 to be reckoned among the 70 disciples. Eusebius directly enumerates 14 Apostles, putting Paul and James among the Twelve (*Ad Jes.*, 17, 5 ff.); he even incidentally cites James v. 13 as the word of the ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος, and represents him as having

[2] This has the less significance in Clement because he elsewhere makes use of ἀπόστολος in its wider sense, even giving the name to men like Clement of Rome and Barnabas (comp. § 9, 5). From the fact that he expressly specifies only two Jameses, the son of Zebedee and James the Just, it has frequently been inferred that he identified the brother of the Lord with James the son of Alphæus; but the simple explanation of this is that only of them could he speak definitely. The James named *before* the heads of the Twelve is certainly not regarded as one of the Twelve.

received his Jerusalem bishopric from the Lord *and* the Apostles (*H. E.*, 7, 19), from whom he therefore clearly distinguishes him. He also mentions several other brethren of Jesus (*H. E.*, 1, 12: εἷς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀδελφῶν ἦν, where the words μαθητῶν ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ ἀδελφῶν are spurious); and in 2, 1 tells how the designation of James as ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου is to be reconciled with the supernatural conception of Jesus (comp. also *Dem. Evang.*, 3, 5).

3. Origen already mentions (*ad Matt.* xiii. 15), a tradition of the Gospel of Peter or the βίβλος Ἰακώβου (comp. Protevang. Jac. 9), according to which the brothers of Jesus named in the New Testament were sons of Joseph by a former marriage. He justly remarks that this was intended as a defence of Mary's virginity, and a safeguard against the idea that she had indulged in carnal intercourse after her miraculous conception; from which it follows however that this apocryphal statement does not rest at all on a varying tradition but is a distortion of fact in the interest of a tendency. Nevertheless Origen accepts it in interpreting John ii. 12; and because Jesus is thus removed from all actual relationship with them, he says (*contr. Cels.*, i. 47) that James is in Gal. i. 19 called the brother of Jesus, οὐ τοσοῦτον διὰ τὸ πρὸς αἵματος συγγενὲς ἢ τὴν χοινὴν αὐτῶν ἀναστροφὴν ὅσον διὰ τὸ ἦθος καὶ τὸν λόγον, which would not, however, prevent him from classing these stepbrothers of Jesus along with his teacher Clement, as Apostles in the wider sense of the term (comp. § 10, 7, note 2).[1] On the other hand Jerome rejected this view of Origen's expressly on account of its Apocryphal source (*ad Matt.* xii., comp. *De*

[1] Origen gave a great impulse to the spread of this view in the East; we find it in Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alex., Epiphanius, Œcumenius, Euthymius, and even in the West in Hilary and Ambrose. Theophylact so far modified it as to hold that Joseph, in accordance with the law of Levirate marriage, had these sons to his deceased brother by his surviving wife.

Vir. Ill., 2); but since he was actuated by the same motives that had given rise to it, he identified James the brother of the Lord with James the Apostle, the son of Alphæus, holding that Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ mentioned in John xix. 25 is designated as the wife of this Alphæus and the sister of Jesus' mother, so that her son James (Mark xv. 40) was a cousin of Jesus, and was only called his brother in a figurative sense. Jerome has explained his view *Adv. Helvid.*, 13, but clearly betrays a consciousness that the statement in John vii. 5 is at variance with it; while in his *Ep.* 120 *ad Hedib.* he only says that many consider Mary the mother of James and Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ as identical. He seems therefore not to have been quite certain on the point himself.[2]

That the identity of James the Lord's brother with the Apostle James, the son of Alphæus, was in any way made out before Jerome must be distinctly disputed. In a passage of the Hebrew Gospel, given in Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.*, 2, Jesus appears to His brother James the Just, and it is here taken for granted that this James was present at the last supper. But it only follows from this that the narrator supposes the brethren of Jesus to have been present with him at the last supper, or that we have here a confusion of persons; for Jerome himself had to contend against those who confounded him with the son of Zebedee. From Hegesippus we learn that according to an old and unvarnished tradition Joseph had a brother of the name of Cleophas (a statement accepted by Theophylact, comp. note 1), whose son Simeon (Hebrew form of Simon, comp. 2 Pet. i. 1) came to be head of the Church at Jerusalem after the death of James. But when he accounts for the choice of this Simeon, whose

[2] Augustine hesitates between the two views that appeared in ancient times, and is content for his own part to pronounce James a relation of the mother of Jesus, without defining such relation more closely (comp. on Gal. i. 19; on Psalm cxxv.; on Matt. xii. 55); whereas Isidore of Spain declares him to have been the son of the sister of Jesus' mother. So too in the East, Chrysostom (on Gal. i. 19) calls him the son of Cleophas, a designation which, judging from his appeal to the Evangelists, can (in John xix. 25) only be understood of the husband of Mary, without identifying the Lord's brethren with the Apostles; whereas Theodoret on this passage expressly designates the son of Cleophas as Jesus' cousin and the son of His mother's sister.

father he calls an uncle of the Lord (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 32), on the ground that all προσέθεντο ὄντα ἀνέψιον τοῦ κυρίου δεύτερον (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 22), and even if δεύτερον be not supplemented by ἐπίσκοπον, this neither proves that he was a second cousin of Jesus in addition to James the son of Alphæus, as Neander and de Wette assume, since from the connection there can be no reference to the latter, nor does it prove that James, whom he elsewhere calls the brother of Jesus (No. 2), was Jesus' cousin, for in this case he would more naturally have spoken of Simeon as the brother of this James, and only as the second relative of Jesus who received the bishopric of Jerusalem. On this assumption the relationship came through Cleophas, the brother of Joseph (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 11), and did not consist in the fact that Cleophas was husband to the sister of Jesus' mother. On Clement of Alex., comp. No. 2, note 2.

4. Origen's view has found very few advocates in recent times. Thus Thiersch, following the precedent of Dr. Paulus, Michaelis and others, held that the brethren of Jesus were stepbrothers by a previous marriage of Joseph's. On the other hand Jerome's view has become the true traditional one in the Protestant Church, virtually retaining its supremacy even during the period of rationalism.[1] The true reason for this view, to which it owes its spread and obstinate defence, was the reluctance to admit that Mary should after the miraculous birth of Jesus have given birth to others in the natural way; and this made it necessary to assume that the so-called brethren of Jesus could not be his full brethren but only his cousins. Nor was it difficult to extend the combination supplied by Jerome. Once admitting that Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ in John xix. 25 was the mother of James the son of Alphæus, it follows from Mark xv. 40 that the son of this Mary had another brother called Joses. And if the Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου named among the Apostles in Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13 were a brother of James the son

[1] The view that the so-called brothers of Jesus were properly speaking His cousins, is represented by Calovius and Buddeus, Lardner and Pearson; we find it in Semler, Gabler, Pott, Schneckenburger, and Theile, as also in Hänlein, Hug, Bertholdt, Guericke, Lange, and Hengstenberg; while it has recently been defended again by Keil in his *Kommentar zu Matthäus* (1877).

of Alphæus (comp. also Jude 1) and Simeon (Simon) the second bishop of Jerusalem were likewise a son of Cleophas (No. 3), we have here the same four names by which the Nazarenes designate the brothers of Jesus (Mark vi. 3); and the proof that these so-called brethren were in reality his cousins seems complete. Nevertheless the combinations by means of which four cousins of Jesus are made to bear the same names with the four brothers mentioned in Mark vi. 3 have no certain foundation whatever. That the Judas of James in Luke's Gospel should be intended for a brother of James, when the genitive Ἀλφαίου is just before employed of his father, is in itself inconceivable and certainly not the meaning of Luke, who, departing from the original order of the apostolic list (Mark iii. 18), puts Simon between the two.[1] Even the view that Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ had two sons of the name of James and Joses, rests only on the assumption, which though very probable has no historical confirmation, that the Mary mentioned in Mark xv. 40 (Matt. xxvii. 56) is the same spoken of in John xix. 25. But the view that these sons were cousins of Jesus involves the most improbable theory that the wife of Cleophas is in John described as the sister of the mother of Jesus, and had therefore a sister of the same name with herself (comp. § 33, 1); unless with Hofmann and Keil we arbitrarily take ἀδελφή here as the sister-in-law, in order to be able to identify the Cleophas here named with the brother of Joseph in Hegesippus. In reality therefore we know only of *one*

[1] In this case it would also be necessary to hold this Simon to be the Simon named in Mark iii. 6, and so to make three of these cousins Apostles; yet it has not been successfully proved that a Simon was brother to the cousins of Jesus, from a combination of John xix. 25 with Mark xv. 40. To the Cleophas' son of Hegesippus this combination, which attaches itself to the sons of Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, dare not appeal; because the former Cleophas was a brother of Joseph, the latter only the husband of his sister-in-law; the former son of Cleophas was a cousin of Jesus by his father, these were sons of Cleophas by their mother.

cousin of Jesus, the Simeon of Hegesippus, to whom Jerome's combination has no reference whatever (comp. note 2); while he has not succeeded in proving the existence of other cousins. But even if the existence of any cousins of Jesus having the same names as the brothers mentioned in Mark vi. 3 could be proved, it is quite incomprehensible how these cousins could come to be called the brethren of Jesus, since we see from Hegesippus how early offence was taken at the latter designation (No. 2, note 1).[3]

It was Clemen who, following in the steps of Richard Simon and Herder, did more than any other to shake the current view (Winer's *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Th.*, 1829, 3). He was followed by Credner, Mayerhoff, Neander, Bleek, and others. De Wette gave up the traditional view which he had advocated in his Introduction of 1826, as also did Kern (comp. *Tübinger Zeitschr.*, 1825, 2, and on the other hand his *Jakobusbrief*, 1838). Compare also Ph. Schaff, *das Verhältniss des Jac. des Bruders des Herrn zu Jac. Alp.*, Berl., 1842; Laurent, *NTliche Studien*, 1865; of late Holtzmann, *Jahrb. f. w. Th.*, 1880, 1; Sieffert in Herzog's *R.-Enc.*, VI. 1880, and even L. Schulze.

5. The view that the brethren of Jesus mentioned in the New Testament were properly speaking his cousins, which is based on a dogmatic assumption, is quite independent of the question whether there were cousins of Jesus among the Apostles; though even in Jerome we find this assumption bound up with the view that the son of Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, the sister of Jesus' mother (John xix. 25), who according to Mark xv. 40 was called James, was identical with James the Apostle, the son of Alphæus.[1] This combination only com-

[3] Lange had on this account to resort to the hypothesis that Joseph adopted the sons of his brother (which these cousins were not, at least according to Jerome) after his death; Keil holding that after Joseph's death the mother of Jesus went to live with her brother-in-law Cleophas, which would manifestly explain the fact of her son being called the son of Cleophas, but not why his sons were called brothers of her son.

[1] Moreover according to the true interpretation of John xix. 25 (§ 33, 1) there were cousins of Jesus among the Apostles, viz. the sons of Zebedee, who however have no connection with the brethren of Jesus mentioned in the New Testament. Besides, the wholly untenable view

mended itself because, by making Judas of James his brother (comp. note 1), the two Canonical Epistles would both come into the category of Apostolic writings. Jerome's view itself rests on the very uncertain assumption that Κλωπᾶς and Ἀλφαῖος were only different forms of the same name, which has of late been warmly disputed (comp. Wetzel, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1883, 3); and has been abandoned even by Keil (*Komm zu Petr. u. Jud.*, 1883); or else on the equally arbitrary assumption of Hofmann and Keil, that the Cleophas of Hegesippus had this Greek name also. In opposition to it, however, we have the express statement that the brethren of Jesus did not believe in Him during His lifetime (John vii. 5); as also the fact that Jesus' brethren were clearly distinguished from the Apostles in the New Testament and elsewhere (No. 1, 2). To get over these two difficulties the poor expedient has been resorted to of supposing that the distinction made between the brethren and the Apostles referred only to Joses and Simon. On the other hand, though the fact of Jesus having true brethren was admitted, Eichhorn, Neudecker, and Schott adhered to the identity of James the Just with James the son of Alphæus; while Winer declared that the question could not be definitely determined; and Hofmann has of late again taken up the standpoint of Eichhorn. If, however, Jesus had literal brothers, the impossibility of supposing that one of His cousins was constantly spoken of as His brother becomes apparent. For this reason Wieseler maintained that the James at the head of the Church in Jerusalem was the Apostle James, the son of Alphæus;

that the Judas of James named among the Apostles was a brother of James the son of Alphæus and therefore a cousin of Jesus (No. 4), has in itself nothing whatever to do with the question whether these brethren were actual brothers of Jesus. Even Tertullian held that Judas the brother of James, who professes to be the author of our Canonical Epistle, was an Apostle; without regarding him as one of these (actual) brothers (No. 2).

though distinguishing him from the Lord's brother in Paul (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 3; *Comm. zu Gal.*, 1859). But it is quite inconceivable that Gal. i. 19 and Gal. ii. 19 should refer to different Jameses. What chiefly gave currency to this view was, as appears in Wieseler, the totally unfounded assumption that only an Apostle could occupy a post of such high authority in Jerusalem.[2] Winer's idea that because Acts i. 13 mentions two Jameses among the Apostles, Acts xii. 2, 17 could only refer to the same two, is equally untenable. For the same reason de Wette held that the author of the Acts confounded the two Jameses.[3] Finally Hofmann takes up the position that Paul in Gal. i. 19 (comp. also 1 Cor. xv. 7) classes the brother of the Lord with the Apostles; whereas he only puts them on the same level of importance with the latter (No. 1, note 3). But his view is already excluded by the fact that in Gal. ii. 9 Paul puts him *before* Peter, and expressly avoids calling the στῦλοι Apostles.

[2] The view taken by Clement of Alexandria of the choice of James for this post points exactly to the contrary (No. 2); and it is in fact quite conceivable that when the Apostle appointed by the Lord Himself to be the head of the Church was obliged to give up his post, his place was not taken by one who had raised himself above the other Apostles in the same arbitrary way, but by one who appeared specially adapted for it on quite other grounds (owing to his relationship with Jesus). As a matter of fact, after the death of James, although there were certainly Apostles still living at that time, none of these was put in his place, but rather a relation of Jesus (comp. No. 3).

[3] The passage xii. 2 does not by any means refer to i. 13 where the son of Zebedee moreover is not called the brother of John, and the Apostles are only enumerated in the way that became customary after Mark, without any designed preparation for the historical narrative that was to follow. The fact that xii. 17; xv. 13 and xxi. 18 speak simply of James plainly shows that this is not the James, the son of Alphæus, mentioned in i. 13 among the Apostles, but the highly honoured brother of the Lord whom Paul too (1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. ii. 9) calls simply James (comp. Jude 1).

§ 37. The Epistle of James.

The Epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes scattered abroad (i. 1); the readers therefore belong exclusively to the Jewish nation and dwell in heathen lands outside Palestine. The view that this designation is merely a transference to the New Testament of an Old Testament characteristic, Christendom in general being meant, overlooks the fact that from the relation of the people of Israel to the twelve tribes and from their local concentration in Palestine, the question is not of a characteristic belonging to it as a theocratic Church but as a national community, and for this reason cannot be transferred to the Christian Church.[1] But

[1] The fact that the typology of the Apocalypse, which is characterized by a constant straining after plastic delineation throughout, represents the Church of God of the Messianic time as a nation of twelve tribes gathered about Mount Zion or having its centre in the holy city (§ 34, 3; 35, 5, note 1), does not prove that the simple language of the Epistle allows such transference to be so far extended as to lose entirely its original sense. For the mere circumstance that the Christians were scattered among the Jews and heathen does not entitle them to be called a Diaspora, since they neither form nor are intended to form in space a united whole, as a nation in the land of its home; nor does the designation apply to Christendom outside Palestine which neither has nor desires to have a local centre in Jerusalem or elsewhere, from which it feels itself divided when not belonging to the people of Israel. The separation from a heavenly home might indeed be characterized as a state of alienation (1 Pet. i. 1), though not as a διασπορά; and to conceive of the earthly Jerusalem as a type of the heavenly home could only be possible to Jewish Christians. This mode of expression has nothing whatever to do with the Pauline transference of theocratic predicates to Israel (§ 31, 2, note 1). Nevertheless Köster and Lücke (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1831), de Wette-Brückner (*Komm.*, 1865), Hengstenberg (*Ev. Krchztg.*, 1866, 93 f.), Grimm (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1870, 4), and the Tübingen criticism *con amore* (although it makes analogous terms in the Apocalypse refer to Jewish Christians) have applied the address to Christendom in general. Comp. finally Holtzman and v. Soden (*Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1884, 1). If it is to be taken in its true, *i.e.* its ethnographical sense, we can neither refer it to mixed Churches, with Bleek and W. Schmidt (*der Lehrgehalt des Jacobusbriefes*, Leipzig, 1869); nor with Thiersch, Hofmann and others make it include the Palestinian

that is already impossible because the Epistle is not a mere collection of sayings with a dedication (comp. Palmer, *Jahrb. f. deutsch. Theol.*, 1865, 1), or a homiletic treatise, least of all a pastoral writing (comp. Reuss), but one that presupposes throughout concrete relations in which the readers are placed and attacks special defects in Church-life. Of these the author can only have gained his vivid perception from the circumstances of definite Churches of the Diaspora;[2] and the general form of the address shows that the author presupposes essentially the same conditions in the Churches of the Diaspora throughout, and therefore intends the letter for them all. He certainly does not address the Jews to whom he writes as believers in Christ;[3] and his characterization of them only in their relation to the Jewish Diaspora cannot possibly be accidental. Rather does it prove that the believers to whom he writes still felt that they belonged entirely to the Israelitish Church, and that the bond of social and religious fellowship with it had not yet been fully dissolved. In ii. 9–11 and iv. 11 f. it is taken for granted that the law has binding force on the readers; they still participated with their fellow-countrymen in the worship of the synagogue and were under its jurisdiction (ii. 2, 6).[4] Since

In any case the Syrian Diaspora of which Beyschlag for example thinks (Meyer's *Komm.*, 1882) must have been much nearer to the Palestinian who wrote the Epistle than the Egyptian one (comp. Bousmann, *Komm.*, 1886), that of Asia Minor (comp. Eichhorn) or even the Roman one.

[3] This cannot be explained by assuming that the author regards believing Jews as the only true ones (comp. *e.g.* Huther, *Komm.*, 1869), since the address does not lay emphasis on the idea of true Jewish nationality (Note 1); still less by supposing that he really writes to converted and unconverted at the same time, as held by Hug, Credner, Guericke, Lange and others, as also by Theile (*Komm.*, 1833); for he turns to them as the servant of Jesus Christ and repeatedly speaks of their faith (ii. 1, 14).

[4] All the arguments brought forward to prove that *συναγωγή* was a name adopted from Greek worship and applied for centuries to Christian assemblies for worship are powerless to make us believe that a Jewish

the hope of gaining their still unbelieving countrymen required the readers to maintain social and religious fellowship with them as long and as far as possible, it was open to the author to suppose that the former might possibly not refuse to listen to a word from him as a servant of God (i. 1) if it reached them through the medium of the first readers. The rich Jewish merchants who in boasting of their intended journeys seem entirely to have forgotten that without God's will and pleasure they can do nothing (iv. 13–17), cannot be Christians any more than those who in i. 10 f. and v. 1–6 are absolutely and unconditionally threatened with the judgment, especially as the (Christian) ἀδελφοί are expressly put in opposition to them. But it is certain that in uttering these warnings and threats the author had his unbelieving countrymen in mind; and in so far the Epistle addressed to the Jews of the Diaspora must be regarded as having been intended for them also.

2. Just as Christianity frequently found acceptance elsewhere with the lower classes (1 Cor. i. 26 ff., comp. Luke vi. 20 f.), so too in the districts of the Diaspora which the author has in view, it was exclusively the poor whom God had chosen (ii. 5, comp. iv. 2). The Christian brother stands in a position

Christian writing to Jewish Christians calls their Church-meetings (Heb. x. 5: ἐπισυναγωγή) by the name of the house of prayer of their unbelieving fellow-countrymen, without distinguishing it in any way; for the ὑμῶν does not denote a Christian synagogue as distinguished from the Jewish one, but that to which they resorted and in which alone the supposed case could have occurred. The reference is not indeed to official arrangement of places but to the supposed case of a believer of Israel, for the purpose of showing servility to a purse-proud Jew, obliging his poor Christian brother to give up his comfortable place to him (ii. 3 f.). But since a Jew of the class of those who tyrannized over the Christians and dragged them before the judgment seats and blasphemed the name of Christ (ii. 6 f.), would not have frequented the conventicle of those Jews who believed in the Messiah, which naturally stood here side by side with the public exercise of worship in the synagogue, as in Jerusalem side by side with the worship of the temple, the scene *must* take place in the Jewish synagogue. Compare Mangold.

of inferiority to his rich fellow-countryman (i. 9 f., comp. No. 1), the poor sigh under the oppression of the rich in whose service they have to seek their bread, and who curtail their wages (ii. 6; v. 4). Naturally their position was made intrinsically worse by the fact that their oppressors looked down on them as schismatics, and thought themselves justified in all they did against them. They not only blasphemed the name of Christ which they professed, but occasionally dragged them before the tribunal of the synagogue (ii. 6 f.): it even seems as if sentence of death had been pronounced in some cases (v. 6, comp. Acts xxvi. 10). These were the divers temptations in which the readers were involved (i. 2, 12); and the second coming of Christ, which was to right them with their oppressors and to reverse their fate, was delayed beyond expectation (v. 7). Whereas faith in the Messiah constantly led to the expectation that He would bring the highest earthly happiness to His followers, the very opposite had come about. Murmurs began to arise against God, who tempted the poor too severely (i. 13). While founding their hope of salvation on the new faith (ii. 14) men forgot that a dead faith which does not prove itself by works, cannot possibly justify before God (ii. 17, 24, 26). They were the more zealous to prove their newly-gained faith by setting up as teachers of their still unbelieving countrymen (iii. 1); but it was zeal mixed with passion and dogmatic striving by which they tried to win others to the faith (iii. 14, 16). They preached repentance, indulging in what they thought was righteous anger against those who would not hear, whereas they only gave reins to their tongue (i. 19 f., 26, comp. iii. 8); they spoke evil of them and judged them, they cursed them (iv. 11; iii. 9 f.) and called to God for vengeance on them (v. 9).[1]

[1] We here recognise the true Jewish propensity to set up as the teacher of others (Rom. ii. 17-20), judging and correcting them (Matt. vii. 1-5). Supposing the ἀλλήλων (iv. 11; v. 9) to refer to the behaviour of Christ-

Such carnal zeal naturally could not attain its aim (i. 20; iii. 18), but only served to bring forth strife and contention (iv. 1, 2). The author justly traces this to secret envy of the better position of their fellow-countrymen, to the lust of possession in their hearts (iv. 2 ff.). For this reason it sometimes happened that a poor fellow-believer was disowned out of repulsive servility to the rich unbeliever (ii. 1–5); such partiality being still excused by the plea of fulfilling the commandment of love (ii. 8).

The immature Christianity of the readers was manifestly shown in the fact that their minds though actively stirred by Christian truth were not yet vitally penetrated by it; and that they proved the new faith by envy and strife, not by active love and patience. In opposition to this many profess to see traces in our Epistle of a declining Christianity, which, sunk in worldliness and torn by doctrinal strife already betrayed most suspicious signs of decay. But our Epistle has no mention of dispute with regard to doctrine, even in ii. 14–26; nor is it easy to understand how such could have arisen at all in circles where Christian doctrine is comprehended in the plain practical truths to which this Epistle points. That chaps. iii. iv. have any reference to such is absolutely disproved by all correct exegesis of the connection in which speaking and striving are mentioned. The worldliness supposed to have been found rests on the totally impossible reference of i. 10 f.; iv. 13–5, 6 to rich Christians, whereas ii. 5 says in the plainest way that it is only the poor that God has chosen; or else on an interpretation of iv. 4 which entirely ignores the context. Even passages like ii. 15 f.; iv. 11 f.; v. 9 can only be taken as a proof that brotherly love had declined, if we forget the special aim to which such example is directed or overlook the manifest concrete circumstances to which those exhortations refer.

3. The very conditions presupposed in our Epistle relegate it to a very early epoch of the Apostolic age. Purely Jewish-Christian Churches whose life was lived

ians to one another, yet after the address has included believing Jews with their unbelieving countrymen, it could only refer to the whole community of which they formed a part; and the τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ (iv. 11), which was only intended to show the atrocity of the offence, is in vers. 12 expressly applied to a fellow-countryman (τ. πλησίον). So also the true Jewish propensity to swearing (v. 12, comp. Matt. v. 34) was quite in keeping with that passionate zeal for the truth which heaven and earth were called to witness.

entirely in the bosom of the synagogue can only have existed outside Palestine before the impulse given to Gentile Christianity by the Pauline mission. Of the existence of such a Church or of the questions that would instantly arise where Jewish and Gentile Christians came into contact, our Epistle shows no trace. Christianity still appears as a movement entirely within Judaism, which was threatened only with the hostility of unbelieving fellow-countrymen and towards which the heathen rulers had as yet assumed no special attitude.[1] It is natural to assume that so soon as faith in the Messiah caused a division in the synagogue, the new party would elect presbyters of their own (for their separate conventicles), just as the presence of elders in the Church at Jerusalem is taken for granted (Acts xi. 30; xv. 2). The presence of elders is therefore no proof that the Epistle was composed at a later time, nor was a priestly character yet ascribed to them; for according to v. 16 care of souls with intercession is expected from all; the elders only appearing as those who were immediately called and qualified.[2] The custom of anointing with oil (v.

[1] Since J. D. Michaelis and Nösselt (*Opusc.* II., 1787); Eichhorn, Schneckenburger (*Beiträge*, 1832), Neander, Thiersch, Ritschl, Lechler, Mangold, and among expositors Theile, Huther, Hofmann, Erdmann (1881) and most others have declared in favour of the high antiquity of the Epistle. Comp. in particular Pfeiffer and Beyschlag, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1852, 1; 1874, 1. It cannot however be proved, though generally assumed, that the Epistle must have been written before Paul's first missionary journey (comp. Beyschlag) or before the Apostolic Council (comp. Erdmann). For the fact that the question of the obligations of Gentile Christians to the law was here discussed, is no reason why we should expect it to be discussed in Churches where there were no Gentile Christians and which did not come into contact with any such. There might have been Churches of this kind in the Diaspora long after purely Gentile-Christian or very mixed Churches had grown up in other districts as a result of Pauline activity. It was only when they were affected by the Gentile-Christian movement, that the increasing hostility of the Jews and the motive-power of Christian brotherly love would of necessity loose the bond with the synagogue.

[2] iii. 1 certainly does not refer to an intrusion of themselves into a

14), of which we hear nothing afterwards, manifestly arose out of a practice commended by Christ Himself to His disciples (Mark vi. 13). The universal character of the address throughout is no proof that the Epistle already presupposes a wide spread of Christianity; and even if ii. 7 referred to the name Χριστιανοί, which is undoubtedly not the case, this, according to Acts xi. 26 would not point to a later time; which is already excluded by the picture of the inner relations of the Church (No. 2). A few not improbable echoes of the first Epistle of Peter, do not, if the right view be taken of the latter, prove anything against its having been composed after the middle of the year 50.[3]

settled *office* of teaching; on the contrary, if the passage referred to teaching in the Church, which is undoubtedly not the case (comp. No. 2), it would only prove that every one who believed himself called and fitted for the work came forward as a teacher, as in Old Testament times. Even if ii. 2 f. referred to the assembling of Christians for worship (comp. No. 1, note 4), the passage in question would have no more reference to an official order or adjustment of places by Church-servants than to a comfortable arrangement of the localities for Divine worship.

[3] Beyschlag does indeed maintain that recent criticism is unanimous in putting the dependence on the side of Peter; but the relation has recently been mostly reversed. Comp. W. Grimm. (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1872, 4), W. Brückner, Holtzman (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, 4; 1882, 3), v. Soden (*Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1884, 1). As a matter of fact the way in which the passage Prov. x. 12 is applied in James v. 20 adheres closely to 1 Pet. iv. 8 (comp. the πλῆθος ἁμαρτ.) where it is conditioned by the application of the passage and is much further removed from its original sense. So too the passage Isaiah xl. 6 ff. is in Peter (i. 24 f.) applied exactly in its original sense, whereas in James i. 10 f. we have only a very free application of its constituent elements. The citation also of Prov. iii. 34 arises more naturally out of the context in 1 Pet. v. 5 than in James iv. 6, where the conclusion that Peter draws from it (v. 6) does not appear till iv. 10; while in iv. 7 a thought is connected with it in which we have an echo of the remoter Petrine context v. 8 f. In James i. 21 the idea contained in 1 Pet. ii. 1 appears in a more definite relation to the exhortation intended, and in James i. 2 f. the thought found in 1 Pet. i. 6 f. forms the assumption on which the exhortation is based. Compare the τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τ. πίστεως, which James, departing from the metonymical use of Peter, applies in its original sense, with the πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις (1 Pet. iv. 10) which looks as if the expression had been rather formulated by Peter.

When notwithstanding, de Wette, Credner, Bleek, Guericke, Ewald, Wiesinger, W. Schmidt, Sieffert, L. Schulze and others still insist on transferring the Epistle to the year 60, they base their opinion on the assumption that the author is acquainted with Pauline Epistles and in ii. 14–26 attacks the Pauline doctrine of justification or rather a widely-spread abuse of it. But apart from the fact that this doctrine was hardly known in purely Jewish-Christian Churches and was certainly not abused in the sense supposed, and that the section throughout attacks errors of life and not of doctrine, James's arguments are never directed to a defence or exposition of the right view of the Pauline doctrine of justification, but show an entire want of acquaintance with it. As exponents of the different views respecting James's doctrine of justification, compare also Weiss, *deutsche Zeitschr. f. chr. Wiss.* etc., 1854, 51 f.; Hengstenberg, *Evangel. Kirchenztg.*, 1866, 93 ff.; Weiffenbach, *Theol. exeg. Stud. über. Jac.* ii. 14–16, Giessen, 1871; Kübel, *über das Verh. v. Glauben und Werken bei Jac.*, Tübingen, 1880. But not to mention that James's conception of faith is essentially different from that of Paul and that the works required by James are not the works of the law attacked by Paul, the fact that the justification of which James speaks is not as with Paul an act of grace in which righteousness is imputed to the sinner, but the act of a judge who by his judicial decision attests the righteousness as proved (Matt. xii. 37) and thus procures deliverance from destruction, is decisive. James does not dispute the Pauline view of Abraham's justification, but bases his exhortation as a matter of course on the opposite view; because he neither knows any other nor regards it as possible (ii. 21 ff.). The alleged Pauline formulas (*μὴ πλανᾶσθε*, *ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις*) belong to Rabbinical dialectics; and expressions such as *ἀκροατής*, *ποιητής*, *παραβάτης νόμου*, *νόμον τελεῖν*, *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐξ ἔργων* (comp. also Jas. ii. 10 with Gal. v. 3) belonging to the legal doctrine of the time; conceptions like *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, *ἐλευθερία* being employed in an entirely different sense. Echoes like i. 3 (Rom. v. 3 f.); iv. 12 (Rom. xiv. 4) can prove nothing, for the reason that they contain nothing specifically Pauline. The whole characteristically Jewish-Christian teaching of the Epistle still undeveloped (comp. No. 5) is only conceivable if we suppose that the author had not yet come into contact with the richly-developed Pauline theology. Undoubtedly we cannot assume a certain knowledge of the Hebrew Epistle, for the act of Rahab is mentioned in ii. 25 with a different object and in an entirely different way from Heb. xi. 31; while nothing else that Holtzman puts forward has any weight whatever. On the selection of the two examples of Abraham and Rahab, comp. Mangold in particular.

4. The introduction of the Epistle transfers us directly to the suffering state of the readers and the divers temp-

tations arising out of it (i. 2–18). The author exhorts them to count all such temptations as joy; pointing to the fulness of blessing that must follow if firmly trusting in God they ask for wisdom, which alone could enable them to attain to perfect patience (i. 2–8). He warns them against attributing to God the seductive character of temptation which, if withstood, can lead to the most blessed goal; for it is only their own evil lust that makes trial a temptation; whereas God, the giver of all good gifts, has by virtue of His highest gift, regeneration through the word of truth, given them power to overcome temptation (i. 12–18).[1] Premising that this word must first of all be heard and received, the author passes on to his *first* leading exhortation, according to which the hearing of the word must not be unaccompanied by the doing of it, because a piety which is not manifested in the life is of no value and cannot meet with Divine approval (i. 19–27). Just as hearing is first attested by corresponding action, so the faith with which the word is received is made manifest by conduct in keeping with it. Hence an eye service that denies faith (ii. 1–7), as every transgression of a single law, makes a man guilty of the whole law and delivers him over to judgment without

[1] Nor are the intervening verses, i. 9 ff., by any means foreign to the context, since they only serve to show that it is this very state of oppression in which the readers are placed as compared with the rich, that leads them into temptation, and yet has the less power to rob them of their triumphant joy in the greatness of their Christian state in proportion as they see the apparent glory of the rich in its true littleness. This greatness however does not consist in the prospect of a glorious goal (i. 12), but in the new birth of which they become ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κτισμάτων (i. 18). We have here the reason why God-given wisdom alone was still needed for the preservation of patience in every temptation (i. 5), since it was this which enabled a man to do what he felt was right, though it did not prevent the constant recurrence of new temptations through evil lust (i. 14). The circumstance that the temptation involved in fighting against sufferings is traced back to evil lust, only shows anew that in the readers' case it arose out of their oppressed state which deprived them of the means for satisfying earthly desires.

mercy, from which the exercise of mercy alone can rescue him (ii. 8–13). Hence the faith which does not prove itself by works is dead and cannot save (ii. 14–26).[2] The *second* leading exhortation begins with a warning against the responsibility incurred in setting up as a teacher of others (iii. 1 f.), because by so doing the temptation to sins of the tongue, so difficult to avoid, becomes almost inevitable (iii. 3–8); the worst of these being held up to view in glaring contrast with the nature of the Christian state (iii. 9–12). Then follows a warning against impure and carnal strife, which is no evidence of true wisdom but a denial of the truth, and yielding no fruit (iii. 13–18). The author shows that the deepest ground of such strife and jealousy lies in the secret desire of earthly enjoyment, in hateful envy of their more prosperous fellow-countrymen, and in unbroken love of the world. God who desires the whole heart cannot supply means for the gratification of their lusts (iv. 1–5). He desires humble submission to the Divine guidance, which can only lead to final exaltation through earnest struggle with the tempter and sincere repentance; whereas backbiting and judging one's neighbours are an encroachment on the prerogative of the only judge (iv. 6–12).[3] The final

[2] While the very transition to this first leading part contains an assertion that hearing is more important than speaking, to say nothing of swiftness to wrath which in no way tends to the exercise of Divine justice (i. 19 f.), we have here, as in the antithesis of i. 26, the fundamental idea of the second leading exhortation, and so far i. 19 has not without reason been termed the theme in a certain sense of the whole Epistle. The example of a denial of faith in actual conduct (ii. 1–7) is drawn from the concrete situation of the readers, which again as in i. 9 f. shows them in opposition to rich unbelievers. We see, however from i. 27; ii. 13 that the question of keeping the word that was heard and of the preservation of faith turns mainly on the fulfilment by the active exercise of mercy of the command to love one another; for which reason dead faith is incidentally illustrated by an inactive sympathy (ii. 15 f.); while the commandment of love is characterized as royal (ii. 8).

[3] The detailed discussion of sins of the tongue (iii. 3–12), like the

section goes back to the things discussed in the introductory part of the Epistle, viz. to rich unbelievers as opposed to the believing poor. To the former he holds up their defiant boasting of their self-glorious projects of travel and trade as a sin against their better knowledge and conscience (iv. 13–17), and threatens them with destruction of themselves and all their treasures in the directly impending judgment, as a punishment for their evil deeds (v. 1–6); the latter he exhorts to leave judgment to God and patiently to await the second coming of the Lord, like the pious sufferer Job (v. 7–11). In a *postscript* follows an express warning against swearing (v. 12), with an indication of the right thing to be done in case of sickness and sin (v. 13–18). The duty of intercession for a brother naturally leads in conclusion to anxious endeavours for the salvation of the erring (the counterpart to their pretended zeal for conversion); while the allusion to the blessing that follows such conduct forms a fine justification for his own letter as also the expression of his wishes on behalf of the readers (v. 19 f.).

There was no ground whatever for declaring section v. 12–20 to be spurious (comp. Rauch, in *Winer u. Engelh. krit. Journal*, VI., 1827 and against him Hagenbach, *ibid.*, VII.), since the addition of detached exhortations, in a postscript, perhaps called forth by definite occurrences, only proves the epistolary character of the work. In spite of the complaint frequently heard since Luther's time that the Epistle has neither plan nor method (comp. Palmer, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1868, 1), it is sufficiently clear that it consistently aims at inculcating an active Christianity, not manifesting itself in talking and striving about faith but in fulfilment of the perfect law and in patience; and the development of ideas in the Epistle, if we bear in mind the gnomologic form and free movement of the author, is perfectly transparent. Comp. Pfeiffer, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1850, 1, as also Gams, *über den Gedankengang des Jacobusbriefes*, Hannover, 1874.

---

characterization of egoistic wisdom, whose counterpart is again shown in mercy and its fruits (iii. 15–18), only shows that the author looks upon arrogant and unlovely loquacity as the besetting sin of believers from among the Jews. The connection of chap. iv. can only be understood by a vivid perception of the entire situation of the readers.

5. It is clear that the Epistle became known to the Church at a comparatively late period, from the circumstance that it was addressed to strictly exclusive Jewish-Christian circles, in whose possession it remained; and referred to relations that soon ceased to have any meaning for the great Gentile Church. The fact however that the Syrian Church had it in their Bible (§ 10, 1) is the more significant as they probably stood nearest to the circles in which it first appeared (No. 1, note 2).[1] Origen and Eusebius are the first to tell us that it proceeded from the Lord's brother; but the former does not yet rank it with the writings of universally recognised authority, while the latter classes it with the Antilegomena owing to the scanty use made of it in the ancient Church (§ 10, 7; 11, 4). This circumstance alone formed the basis of later doubts respecting the Epistle; in spite of which it attained to universal ecclesiastical recognition in the 4th century.[2] In calling himself simply James and describ-

[1] The history of the Canon teaches that although undoubtedly much used by the Shepherd of Hermas (§ 6, 4) it does not at the end of the second century yet belong to the New Testament, and is likewise wanting in the Muratorian Canon (§ 9, 5; x. 3). The fact that the author does not call himself an Apostle can have been no hindrance to its spread, at least in the East, still less its doctrinal character, which necessarily corresponded entirely with the more legal conception of Christianity in the post-Apostolic period. But it does not appear from Ephraem the Syrian which James was regarded by the Syrian Church as its author.

[2] When Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.*, 2) speaking of James the Just the brother of the Lord, says, "unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit autoritatem," he evidently goes back to Eusebius, *H. E.*, 2, 23, and misunderstands his *νοθεύεται*, which refers only to inclusion in the Canon, as implying doubts of its genuineness. So too Theodore of Mopsuesta in rejecting it (*Leont. Byz. c. Nestor. et Eutych.*, iii. 14) undoubtedly reverted only to the statement of Eusebius. Even if the Epistle owed its later universal recognition to the circumstance that it became more and more usual to regard the James who composed it as the Apostle, such view was in nowise influenced by the wish to secure a place in the Canon for a writing highly esteemed by the ancient teachers of the Church; for the principle to admit only what was Apostolic had never been practically carried out. Nor does the view of its apostolicity

ing himself only as the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ (i. 1), his self-designation would only be intelligible to the readers on the supposition that he was the Lord's brother, who by his authoritative position at the head of the Church in Jerusalem (§ 36, 1) possessed such pre-eminence that it was not necessary to distinguish himself from others of the same name. It is only in the case of one who was regarded by all Jewish Christians as the supreme authority (Gal. ii. 12), that it is conceivable how he could address himself to all the believing Jews of the Diaspora with words of such earnest reproof and warning. Above all it is only on the assumption that it was this James, who even among his unbelieving countrymen was held in such high esteem, that we can understand how he could hope that they too would not refuse to listen to a word of exhortation coming from him (comp. No. 1).[3] But the whole doctrinal peculiarity of the Epistle is entirely in keeping with the historical portrait of this James in whom alone, on account of his legal piety, the Messianic faith seems to have fulfilled the ideal of a genuine Israelite.

The authority of the law is throughout taken for granted as a matter of course (ii. 9–11 ; iv. 11 f.) ; and it is entirely arbitrary of Holtzmann to set this aside (in his Introduction) by a simple denial. It certainly

---

prejudice the question as to its authorship ; since the question whether the Lord's brother was one of the Twelve, or had only the dignity of an Apostle in conjunction with them, was not yet determined at the time when the Canon was formed (compare § 36).

[3] It certainly does not follow that because the author does not call himself an Apostle, he was not one (comp. Phil. i. 1 ; 1 Thess. i. 1), but only that a pseudonymous writer would not have chosen this form for the purpose of giving Apostolic authority to his exhortations. Even if the pseudonymous writer had the brother of the Lord in his mind, he must have called himself such in order to vindicate his authority ; a thing that was unnecessary only in case his readers knew that he really was so. On the other hand the appeal made to the similarity between the epistolary greeting and Acts xv. 23 is very doubtful, since the authenticity of this portion of the Acts is not certain ; nor is such greeting peculiar to it (comp. Acts xxiii. 26).

does not follow from the fact that the so-called ceremonial law is nowhere expressly mentioned, that one who so emphatically asserts the solidarity of the whole law (ii. 10) regards it as no longer binding on the Messiah-believing Jews. Moreover the circle of these, that might still be entirely filled up by the Jews of the Diaspora, was essentially limited; and if James had sought to fulfil the law in the sense of the prophets whom he so highly esteemed (v. 10), this aspect naturally receded into the background as compared with the moral essence of the law (comp. i. 27). But if the word of truth by which believers know that they are born again (i. 18) is with him primarily a word that is to be done, a perfect law (i. 22 f. 25), it is clear that he refers to such fulfilment of the law as was taught by the Messiah who appeared in Jesus; who therefore seems to be also regarded in iv. 12 in the light of a lawgiver and a judge.[4] The word of truth contains at the same time an announcement that the second coming of the Messiah who has been exalted to glory (ii. 1) immediately precedes the judgment (v. 3, 7–9); hence this word, if rightly received and appropriated, must lead to the doing of the Divine will revealed in it; and faith in it to the performance of such works as are pleasing to God, thus bringing about salvation (i. 21 ff.; ii. 14 ff.). Hence the salvation brought by the Messiah really consists in the fact that He has given us power rightly to discern and fulfil the Divine will, because the law is now written in the heart (comp. the λόγος ἔμφυτος i. 21, and with it Jer. xxxi. 33). Moreover trust in the Divine goodness which hears the prayer of faith (i. 5–7), which draws nigh to those who in repentance and humility draw nigh to Him and lifts them up (iv. 8–10), gives succour in bodily need and forgives sin (v. 13–18), rewards the pious sufferer with the crown of life (i. 12; v. 10 f.), promises the kingdom to them that love Him and grants mercy in the judgment to the merciful (ii. 5, 8); all this is presupposed as a matter of course for the Israelite, requiring no special preliminary mediation by the Messiah. Such a doctrinal view is only conceivable in the case of one who looks for salvation as a matter of course in the fulfilment of the Divine will not in the Pharisaic but in the true Old Testament sense, and has found the required strength in faith in the Messiahship of Jesus.

The fact that this James had during the lifetime of Jesus held back from the circle of His disciples and had only been

[4] Hence he calls the command of love to one's neighbour, quoted from the Scripture, the royal law, after His example (ii. 8, comp. Matt. xxii. 39) and lays special emphasis on mercy (i. 27; ii. 13, 15 f.; iii. 17); after His example he declares judging and swearing to be positively forbidden (iv. 11; v. 9, 12), and appears to regard anger as equivalent to murder (iv. 2, comp. Matt. v. 22).

led to believe by His resurrection (§ 36, 1), explains why Old Testament types alone are employed (ii. 21, 25; v. 10 f. 17), and not the example of Christ; while many of the utterances of Jesus current in Apostolic tradition are re-echoed.[5] On the other hand it is in keeping both with the time of the Epistle and with the singularly retired nature of this James, that he is completely untouched by the deeper and richer conception of the salvation given in Christ, as already developed in the primitive Apostolic circle and in its entire fulness by Paul; but rather seeks his life-nurture in Old Testament Scripture, more especially in its proverbial wisdom.[6]

[5] There can be no question that the sayings contained in Matt. vii. 1 (iv. 12; v. 9), vii. 7 f. (i. 5; iv. 3), v. 34 (v. 12), xxiii. 12 (4, 10) belong to earliest tradition; and the same may be said of the saying repeated in i. 6, 25, though only preserved for us in later records (Mark xi. 23; John xiii. 17). There is nothing to show that as thus recorded they are taken from our written Gospels; on the contrary we not seldom find striking points of actual resemblance that show no trace of the wording of our Gospels, thus for example i. 22 (Matt. vii. 26), ii. 8 (Matt. xxii. 39), ii. 13 (Matt. v. 7; xviii. 33 f.), iv. 4 (Matt. vi. 24), iv. 17 (Luke xii. 47), and in the second half of v. 12 we even find an essentially distinct form of Matt. v. 37, which, however widely spread throughout the Church, is nevertheless the remodelling of a tradition. We are the less justified in attaching importance to isolated expressions and images which neither prove connection with the Gospels nor with the utterances of Christ, such as τέλειος, δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον, εἰρήνην ποιεῖν, σητόβρωτος, μοιχαλίδες, or the figures in iii. 12.

[6] With the exception of the words of the law in ii. 8, 11 and the citation of Prov. iii. 34 borrowed from Peter, as also the references to Isa. xl. 6; Prov. x. 12 (comp. No. 3, note 3) drawn from the same source, our Epistle contains no actual quotation. On the other hand the author's entire phraseology is modelled on the language of the Prophets (iv. 8, comp. Zech. i. 3) and Psalms (iii. 8, comp. Ps. cxxxix. 3; v. 3, comp. Ps. xxi. 10), and particularly on the proverbial wisdom of the Old Testament. This is shown less in individual resemblances than in the general gnomologic form and figurative style, as also in the emphasizing of wisdom (i. 5; iii. 13–17), in which, as in these, the knowledge of the Divine will having become habitual, no longer appears to require an external law. It has been incorrectly held by most that the author adheres very closely to Jesus Sirach; for with the exception of i. 19, where in spite of apparent similarity in thought and expression the ten-

6. After Erasmus and Cajetan had already expressed doubts respecting the traditional Apostolic origin of the Epistle of James, Luther attacked it with great vigour.[1] Calvin disputed his verdict and maintained that the Epistle was not unworthy of an Apostle. On the other hand the Magdeburg centuriators, Hunnius, Althammer, Wetstein and the Lutheran Church in general so long as it tolerated a departure from ecclesiastical tradition, followed Luther. It is only of late that his polemic has again been revived in its former keenness from a hyper-Lutheran standpoint (comp. Strobel, *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1857, 2; 1860, 1; 1869, 4; 1871, 2; whom Kahnis and Delitzsch occasionally seconded). In recent times the critical question has more correctly been limited to the point as to whether the Epistle proceeds from James the Lord's brother. Schleiermacher found that it was pompous in style, the train of thought being sometimes affected and again artificial and awkward. He ascribed the "fabrication" to a pupil of the Palestinian James who wrote down recollections of his master's discourses in his name, in a language in which he himself was not fluent. On the other hand de Wette found

dency is entirely different from that of Sir. v. 11; i. 5 has only one expression in common with Sir. xx. 14 without similarity of thought, and i. 13 a thought resembling that of Sir. xv. 12 without similarity of expression. But it must be distinctly denied that there is anywhere an echo of the Book of Wisdom; while Lösner's uncritically gathered parallels prove nothing in favour of an acquaintance with Philo; for the expressions in common belong solely to the Hellenistic stock of words.

[1] He took offence at its contradiction of the doctrine of Paul and silence respecting the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, as also with respect to the spirit of Christ. He calls it a downright epistle of straw that has nothing evangelical in character, and runs one thing into another without any method. The author was some good and pious man who caught a few sayings from the Apostle's disciples and put them on paper in this form (*Vorr. z. N. T.*, v., 1522). How little he understood the question on which the origin of our Epistle turns, is seen in the fact that he speaks of the Apostle to whom he denies the Epistle, as James the son of Zebedee.

the ornate Greek style incompatible with the view of its genuineness.[2] But although Schmidt and Bertholdt looked on our Epistle as the Greek translation of an Aramaic original, it is now fully recognised that even a Palestinian might have acquired facility in writing Greek and must have written in Greek to Jews of the Diaspora; and the scruples on account of style are removed simply by the author's attachment to the Old Testament, which, owing to the defective knowledge of ancient Hebrew outside the theology of the schools, could only be read in the LXX. even in Palestine. The doubts to which Kern (*Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1835, 2) gave currency on account of the alleged affinity of the Epistle with the Clementines, owing to the use of Old Testament Apocryphal writings, Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews, he himself has retracted in his commentary (1838). On the other hand W. Grimm (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1870, 4) has substantially revived the scruples of de Wette; and Schenkel has described the Epistle as the work of an unknown James at the end of the year 70, who wrote to the Church in Rome.

7. To all appearance the Tübingen school could only look upon the alleged polemic of the Epistle against Paul as a confirmation of their assumption that a strong opposition exists between James and the Gentile Apostle; but since its attitude in other respects towards the law was manifestly not in keeping with this theory of the legal standpoint of primitive Christianity, it must have been a pseudonymous writer of a later time who made this James the mouthpiece

[2] His remaining doubts, which are not unjust, only apply to the false view of the Epistle that was prevalent. He rightly doubts whether the Christendom outside Palestine was in James's time already so deeply sunk in worldliness (comp. No. 2); and whether the historical James could have carried on so keen a polemic against Paul without understanding him (comp. No. 3), whereas his own standpoint over against the law shows no trace of a narrow-minded, anti-Pauline Jewish Christianity.

of his spiritualized Jewish Christianity in order to obviate a view of the Pauline doctrine of justification which was detrimental to practical Christianity. It was Schwegler who first endeavoured to give a firmer historical outline to this view of the Epistle taken by Baur, which was still quite undeveloped. He regarded it as a parallel to the Clementine Homilies, an apology for the two modes of thought common to Ebionism, intended to reconcile the opposing tendencies on the ground and within the principle of Jewish Christianity. He makes the antithesis between rich and poor that pervades the Epistle refer to secularized Pauline Gentile Christianity as contrasted with primitive Christian Ebionism. Polemical references to Gnosis and the persecutions of the time of Trajan are already visible.[1] In this respect also Hilgenfeld sought to modify the conception of the school, putting the Epistle back to the time of Domitian, making out that the wisdom attacked was that of Paulinism which had brought about the internal disunion of Christendom by its doctrinal disputes, drawing a distinction between secularized Christians and the rich Gentile enemies of Christianity, and finally declaring the Christianity of the author to be Essene and Orphic in character. Holtzmann likewise adheres to the same determination of time (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1882, 3) mainly on account of the alleged dependence of the Epistle on the Paulines together with the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the Apocalypse (in behalf of which, appeal is made to i. 12, comp. Apoc. ii. 10; i. 18, comp. Apoc. xv. 4; ii. 5, comp. Apoc. ii. 9), on the first Canonical Gospel, 1 Peter, and the Epistle of Clement, declaring the rich to

[1] The Epistle also belongs to this time in Hausrath's view, who regards it as a direct answer of Jewish Christianity to the Epistle to the Hebrews; as also in the opinion of Brückner (*Jahrb. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, 4), who pronounces the whole address a literary fiction and makes it the aim of the Epistle to keep a Romish conventicle of Essene-minded Jewish Christians excluded from the heathen world and from the Christianity that had been influenced by Paulinism.

be distinguished aspirants to Christianity. Finally v. Soden also puts the persecutions of Domitian's time into the centre of the presupposed situation and pronounces the author, whom with Holtzmann and others he transfers to Rome, as of a kindred spirit with Clement and Hermas.

All these views are based on the arbitrary assumption of the Tübingen school, that primitive Christianity was unable to sustain the position of Jesus Himself with respect to the law; they have to put a wrong interpretation on the address, at variance with the wording (comp. No. 1, note 1), and thus create the opposition in which its universal form is said to stand to the concrete relations presupposed in the Epistle itself; of which indeed they are only able to give a caricature. In particular the rich of the Epistle are explained away in the most arbitrary manner, or divided into Christians and non-Christians. V. Soden on the other hand has with great impartiality shown that an attack on the Pauline doctrine of justification, which Holtzmann also declared to be outside all serious discussion, is quite out of the question, and has only by the exercise of great ingenuity reconciled his assumption of a knowledge of the Pauline Epistles with the entire absence of a more developed type of doctrine, especially with respect to the death of Christ. For this reason he has decidedly rejected the fictions of Essenism or even Orphic tendencies in the Epistle, as also the theory of a polemic against gnosticism, or a dependence on the Apocalypse, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the first Gospel. Thus criticism itself returns to the only correct view of the Epistle, which not only makes its high antiquity and its composition by the brother of the Lord possible, but directly necessary; though Holtzmann in his Introduction professes only to find in this view a display of "childlike joy," which marks the "amiable character" of Apologetics.

§ 38. The Epistle of Jude.

1. In the inscription with its invocation of a blessing the author characterizes his readers in a general way as true Christians (vers. 1 ff.), and explains that an exhortation to contend against every danger threatening the faith common to them with all the saints, forms the substance of his epistle; certain men having appeared, whom on account of their perversion of the fundamental truths of Christianity, he already finds condemned in Old Testament Scripture as

ungodly (vers. 3 ff.). He reminds them of three well-known examples of Divine punishment (vers. 5–7) and calls down upon such as defile and destroy themselves with fleshly sins, after the example of those who were overtaken by these judgments, emancipating themselves from all that is called dominion and speaking evil of dignities of whose nature they are entirely ignorant, a woe that again recalls three prominent examples of Old Testament sinners (vers 8–11).[1] From the way in which they recklessly desecrate without fear the love-feasts with rioting, he shows in heightened imagery that they are not what they profess to be, but are entirely devoid of spiritual life; that their nature impelled by wild passion attests their own shame and can only end in destruction, which he foretells in the words of the threat pronounced by Enoch on the ungodly of his time; finally setting forth the twofold contrariety of their nature, in accordance with which they murmur against God, although by their licentious life they prepare their own fate; and make boastful speeches, though ready to cringe before those from whom they expect advantage (vers. 12–16). He recalls words of the Apostles foretelling the appearance of frivolous mockers who should walk after their own ungodly lusts, and not without irony characterizes them as those who separate themselves although in reality they are psychists, not having the Spirit (vers. 17 ff.). In opposition to such, the readers are to seek an increase of faith, keeping themselves through prayer,

[1] Just as κυρίοτητα in ver. 8 naturally refers to the κυρίοτης of Christ (ver. 4), although the expression is intentionally put in such a general way because the object is to show that they virtually disregard what demands unconditional subordination, so ver. 9 undoubtedly shows that by the δόξαι of which they speak evil instead of trembling before them, are meant the Satanic powers under whose dominion they fall in giving themselves up to heathen abominations. While this only betrays defective knowledge of such supersensuous things, their instinctive knowledge of sensuous things which they know how to use as means of enjoyment, only leads to their destruction (ver. 10).

as taught by the Spirit, in the love of God, and expecting to obtain eternal life from the mercy of Christ in the judgment. On their side they are then to have compassion on these erring ones, only seeking to pluck those who still hesitate, as a brand from the fire; whereas with respect to the rest, fear of infection is to keep them from all active manifestation of compassion (3, 20–23).[2] The Epistle concludes with a solemn doxology (vers. 24).

2. The historical understanding of the Epistle depends essentially on a correct view of the phenomenon against which it is directed. The traditional view regarded it as an attack on errorists, and judging by vers. 4, 17 f., on such as were assailed and prophesied of in the second Epistle of Peter (ii. 1 ff.; iii. 2).[1] But if we give up this reference,

[2] The reading of the Cod. Vat.: οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες, etc. suspected entirely without reason and accepted even by Westcott-Hort, is here assumed to be correct. It is clear that the distinction of a double ἐλεᾶν, an active compassion that tries to save what may yet be saved, and a compassion that is merely sympathetic, in which fear of hateful defilement of one's self forbids all approach and hence all attempt to save, was just as unintelligible to the copyists as the irregular σώζετε explanatory of the first ἐλεᾶτε, which was necessary because, on account of the subsequent participle ἁρπάζοντες, it could not be participially expressed in the parallel by μισοῦντες. This explains all those variations, none of which gives a supportable sense.

[1] This is the view of Luther, Michaelis, and Hänlein, as of Thiersch, Th. Schott (*Komm.*, 1863), Hofmann, Spitta (*der 2. Brief des Petr. und d. Brief d. Jud.*, Halle, 1885). But οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι in ver. 4 cannot possibly refer to a recently composed Apostolic writing, but only to Old Testament scripture; and apart from the fact that 2 Pet. iii. 2 refers to an entirely different manifestation and that the most peculiar feature of the prediction in ii. 1 has here no analogy whatever; ver. 17 ff., apply not to the written prediction of an Apostle, but to the repeated oral predictions of Apostles. Besides, the powerful originality of our Epistle is altogether adverse to the assumption that its description of these people, as also its imagery and examples are borrowed from the second Epistle of Peter, which however from the extensive agreement between them must necessarily have been the case, though denied by Keil (*Komm.*, 1883), if Jude had any reference to this Epistle.

which is quite untenable, there is no longer the slightest ground for thinking of errorists, as Ritschl (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1861, 1) has already shown. No mention is made anywhere of doctrines disseminated by them nor are such doctrines attacked; and to make ἀποδιορίζοντες (vers. 19) refer to divisions caused by them in the Church, is at variance with the wording as well as the context.[2] Nor can we agree with de Wette, Reuss, Bleek and Schwegler in supposing an allusion only to wicked men or only to such as by their immoral life exercised a seductive influence in the Church. It is not against individual moral errors or imperfections in the Christian life that the Epistle is directed; but the conduct of these men is represented throughout as fundamentally godless and immoral. We see clearly from vers. 3 that they misinterpreted the doctrine of grace as a charter for a

[2] How impossible it is to define these so-called errorists is best seen from the fact that Schneckenburger (*Beitr.*, 1832) regarded them as an antithesis to the system of religion attacked in the Colossian Epistle, misinterpreting ver. 8 as the denial of angels; L. Schulze maintaining on the contrary that they were an advanced form of the errorists there attacked (comp. Sieffert in Herzog's *R.-Enc.*, VII., 1880); as from the fact that it is disputed whether they were Jewish Christians (Credner, according to Hegesipp. ap. Eus., *H.E.*, 4, 22 and also Grau), or Gentile Christians, as has of late been generally assumed. It is only a false way of putting the question to contend as to whether the adversaries of our author kept their principles to themselves, as Ritschl maintains, in which case our Epistle itself cannot have had any reference to them; or whether they made a propaganda for them as most recent critics infer from the rejection of the former view, since in this case they would certainly have been errorists and their doctrines would necessarily have been attacked in our Epistle, which however is not the case. But between these there is a third possibility that very naturally suggests itself, viz. that they did try to extenuate and justify their conduct by appealing to fundamental principles, but had no interest in formulating these principles into a doctrine and disseminating them in opposition to the prevailing doctrine; for which reason the author does not consider it worth his while to refute them. For the same reason Holtzmann's assumption as a matter of course of a reference to the unsuitable predictions of the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1 f.; iv. 3) is simply at variance with the context.

licentious life, and what Paul distinctly repudiates in Rom. vi. 15 they held to be the logical consequence of his doctrine of grace, assuming that those who were in a state of grace were emancipated from all external rule, and thus free not only from the Old Testament law but also from every new rule of life given by Christ; a course of proceeding which the author characterizes as a rejection of his κυρίοτης. An abuse of Pauline views is also shown in the fact, to which the ironical allusion in ver. 19 to their separation manifestly points, that they regarded themselves as the true pneumatists, taught by the spirit to despise the devil (ver. 8), and to use for enjoyment what was made for enjoyment (ver. 10). Hence their swelling words (ver. 16), with which they raised themselves above the psychists who adhered to the common standpoint of faith, because their assurance of faith was not weakened by any carnal pleasure; for which reason the author so emphatically designates the former traditional faith that needed no improvement as "most holy" (vers. 3, 20). It is not therefore exactly the misunderstood doctrine of Christian freedom on which they took their stand, as Bleek maintains; but as a matter of fact we find them to be libertines on principle, who, unable or disinclined to enter more deeply into questions of doctrine (comp. Note 2), were content to have justified their immorality by an appeal to their unshaken state of grace and their enlightened spiritual Christianity.[3]

[3] The Nicolaitanes of the Apocalypse (§ 35, 1) to which most critics point (comp. Ewald, Huther, and others), unquestionably present a phenomenon essentially similar, but the circumstance that libertinism was grounded on a deeper gnosis, is here entirely wanting (ii. 24) since all references to Gnostic speculation which have been found here (*e.g.* the ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι ver. 8) must first be artificially interpreted in this sense. Hence there can be no question of precursors of the Gnostic system of the second century, such as Thiersch, Wiesinger, Keil and others here discovered and of which there is no proof whatever; nor yet of Sadducean minded Christians, as assumed by Bertholdt.

3. An Epistle which deals throughout with a concrete phenomenon which had evidently only a short time before come into the readers' range of vision (ver. 4), which speaks of people who desecrate *their* love-feasts (ver. 12), and gives special directions for their treatment (ver. 22 f.), cannot possibly be termed a Catholic Epistle in the strict sense; as maintained by Ewald, Sieffert, and Holtzmann.[1] Since the Epistle was of course personally transmitted, it did not require any mention of place in the inscription; and since moreover it was not addressed to the Churches in which it was to be read, as such, for it was to these that the Libertines belonged, but expressly to those alone who had remained true (ver. 1), it was impossible to name a definite Church or circle of Churches. The traditional view, that the Epistle is connected with the predictions of the second Epistle of Peter, led to the idea that it was addressed to the Churches of Asia Minor; but although this view is without foundation, the historical analogy of the Nicolaitanes points likewise to the Church-circle of Anterior Asia. It must doubtless be conceded that analogous phenomena may readily have appeared elsewhere, and that we might therefore just as well think of the Syrian Churches, as de Wette did. But it is at any rate more likely that such errors would arise in a circle in which Paul had constantly worked during the later years of his ministry, when his doctrine of grace excluding all regulating principles of legality was more sharply defined.[2] This libertinism, appealing for its

[1] Sieffert's view that the author originally intended to write an epistle of universal purport (*περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας*) in keeping with the universal address, and only found himself obliged to give it a more particular character on the appearance of definite local phenomena in the Church, rests on the very generally accepted (comp. Spitta), but utterly impossible distinction between an intended and a written epistle in ver. 3; and does not set aside the fact that a reference to local phenomena presupposes also a local circle of readers.

[2] The Jewish-Christian character of the Epistle naturally suggested

basis to a principle, also affords the only secure foundation for determining the time of the Epistle; for it by no means follows from ver. 17, where we are reminded of the words of the Apostles, that all the Apostles were already dead, but only that the Churches were at that time deprived of their guidance.[3] On the other hand the first appearance of this false libertinism which, as the Apocalypse shows, had at the end of the year 60 already made a theoretical foundation for itself, having formed a school with apostles and prophets, and in opposition to which the Church as such was forced to take up a position (§ 35, 1), may be put soon after the middle of the year 60; when the longer removal of the Apostle from his sphere of activity made it possible to misinterpret his doctrine, for which the motive undoubtedly lay in a lowering of the Christian moral standard already foreseen by Paul (2 Tim. iii. 1–5).

On the hypothesis, which however is very questionable, that Jude would not have taken up the pen before the death of his renowned brother, the year 62 is generally regarded as the terminus *a quo* for the composition of the Epistle; Credner and Sieffert making it 69. But although the latter puts it between 70 and 80 because the form of error here attacked is more developed than that of the Nicolaitanes, it is manifest that the exact opposite is the case. The reasons for which Ewald, Th. Schott

---

the Churches of Palestine (comp. Credner, Wiesinger, *Komm.*, 1862, with an appeal to Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 22), although errors thus based on a misinterpretation of Paulinism could only have appeared in Gentile-Christian and not in Jewish-Christian circles; while an acquaintance with oral Apostolic predictions (ver. 17) is quite conceivable outside Palestine. Hence the thought of any Jewish-Christian Church is for the same reason equally shut out, which Spitta in an incomprehensible way entirely overlooked.

[3] Though ver. 5 certainly cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, as Hofmann supposes, yet seeing that the choice of the two other examples had manifestly some special motive, we cannot maintain with Bertholdt, Guericke and others that Jude must have named such destruction among the chastisements to which he points, if it had already lain behind him; much less with Bleek, on the basis of a misinterpretation of ver. 8 in our Epistle, can we regard it as referring to a political uprising of the Palestinian Jews before the final catastrophe.

and Hofmann go down to this time are still less defensible; and if only grandchildren of Jude were alive at the time of Domitian (Eus., *H. E.*, 3, 20), it is most improbable that he himself was still living towards the end of the year 70. That no determination of time with regard to our Epistle can be drawn from the use of the Book of Enoch, to which Credner and de Wette still attach importance, or even from the date of the origin of the Assumptio Mosis, is now universally admitted. Renan (in his *Paulus*) makes out that the Epistle was written as early as 54 against Paul, by the brother of James, who was embittered owing to the manifestation in Antioch.

4. The Epistle, though not contained in the oldest Syriac Church Bible, was early known in the West and was counted a part of the New Testament by Tertullian who ascribes it to the Apostle Jude, as also by the Muratorian Canon, probably for the same reason (§ 9, 5; 10, 3). So too in the Alexandrian Church it was already used and commented on by Clement, and was very highly esteemed by Origen; although it was already known here that the brother of James by whom it was written, did not belong to the Apostles in the stricter sense (§ 9, 5; 10, 7). Eusebius classes it with the Antilegomena for the same reason as the Epistle of James (§ 11, 4); and from the fact that Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 4), certainly exaggerating, says that the Epistle of the *frater Jacobi a plerisque rejicitur* on account of the citation from Enoch, we see clearly that at his time, when a sharper distinction was made between the apocryphal and the canonical, offence was already taken at its use of a Jewish Apocryphon; but its ecclesiastical recognition was no longer endangered by this. The author in ver. 1 styles himself the brother of James, which, if this self-designation is to be intelligible, can only mean the Lord's brother who stood at the head of the Church in Jerusalem. He too, like James himself, was not an Apostle (§ 36); he makes no claim, however, to apostolic authority, but on the contrary in ver. 17 distinctly separates himself from the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. That the author was a Jewish Christian is seen from the whole Epistle, which lives and moves in the figurative language of

the Old Testament (vers. 12f., 23), as well as in its history (vers. 5–7, 11), though likewise at home in Jewish tradition.[1] This however is least of all at variance with the view that the Epistle was composed by a prominent member of the Jewish-Christian primitive Church. The fact that an author who attacks a tendency arising out of a misinterpretation of Pauline doctrine, has also points of contact with Pauline ideas, is not enough to justify the conclusion that he was acquainted with Pauline writings, as Wiesinger assumes (comp. de Wette, who discovered that the concluding doxology of the Roman Epistle had been made use of in ver. 25); however facile such acquaintance would be in the second half of the year 60. Although the Epistle itself gives no indication of any former relation on the part of the author with his readers, yet the very fact that Jude, who from his calling himself δοῦλος Ἰησ. Χριστ. (ver. 1) certainly took an active part in working for the kingdom of God, turns to the Churches of Asia Minor in their danger, sufficiently proves that such was the case. This can only seem strange if we refuse to recognise what is undoubtedly affirmed in 1 Cor. ix. 5, viz. that even the brethren of Jesus undertook missionary journeys at a very early date, naturally to the Jewish Diaspora; whose believing members, however, had at this time been long amalgamated in many ways with the Gentile-Christian Pauline Churches.[2]

[1] Hence it is a matter of total indifference whether he takes the narrative of the Archangel Michael's dispute with Satan for the body of Moses to which he alludes in ver. 9, from it or from a Jewish Apocryphon; (according to Origen, *De Princ.*, 3, 2, from the Assumptio Mosis; comp. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judæorum*, Lips., 1869); it is certain that in ver. 14 f. he quotes from the Book of Enoch (comp. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch.*, Leipz., 1853) and therefore probably also took the tradition of the punishment of the sinful angels in ver. 6 from it; for Hofmann's view (comp. F. Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch.*, Stuttgart, 1868), that on the contrary the Book of Enoch quotes from the Epistle of Jude, and that the latter has only drawn out the allusions of the Old Testament independently, needs no refutation.

[2] We do not even know whether Jude was still in Palestine when he

5. Luther denied to this Epistle the apostolic origin to which it lays no claim whatever, partly on the just ground that the author speaks as an apostolic disciple, partly on the quite erroneous assumption that it copies the second Epistle of Peter and cites unbiblical sayings and stories. On this point criticism for a time spent much fruitless groping,[1] until Jessien (*De Authent. Ep., Jud.*, Lips. 1821) showed clearly that the Epistle was not the work of an Apostle, but professed to come and actually did come from the true brother of the Lord, the well-known James of Jerusalem. Since his time the earlier view, that it professed to come from Jude the brother of James, one of the Twelve (comp. Bertholdt, Hänlein), has only been advocated by such intrepid defenders of tradition as Hofmann and Keil; whereas all defenders of its genuineness, even L. Schulze, adhere only to the real brother of the Lord. Even de Wette found no adequate reason for denying the Epistle to this Jude. In Schwegler's opinion it was a foregone conclusion that the author only borrowed the mask of a brother of James, because the latter was in the eyes of Jewish Christians the chief representative of that apostolic paradosis which he desired to commend (vers. 3, 17 f., 20); but it is inconceivable why in this case he should have chosen

wrote this Epistle, which Credner, Bleek, and de Wette only infer from the fact that his grandchildren were settled in Palestine as agriculturists (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 20); although Mayerhoff's wonderful idea (in his *Einl. in die petr. Schriften*), that the imagery of the Epistle points to Egypt, has long been abandoned. There is the less reason to look for an Aramaic original in the case of our Epistle, after the example of Schmidt and Bertholdt, or to take offence at its ornamented Greek style, especially as the somewhat overdone and far-fetched imagery of the Epistle is actually modelled on that of the Old Testament, while the style least of all shows facility in Greek structure.

[1] Grotius held the author to be the 15th bishop of Jerusalem who lived under Hadrian (Eus., *H. E.*, 4, 5); Dahl (*De Authent. Ep. Petr. Post. et Judæ*, Rost., 1807) as a presbyter of the name of Jude; while Schott even thought of Judas Barsabas mentioned in Acts xv. 22; and Eichhorn left the author quite undetermined. Nor could Schleiermacher, Neander or Reuss make anything of the Epistle.

Jude who was quite unknown, and not James himself. On the other hand the latest criticism, represented by Hilgenfeld and Volkmar, Schenkel and Mangold, Lipsius and Holtzmann, has interpreted the Epistle as an attack on the Antinomian Gnosis of the second century, particularly that of Carpocrates (comp. also Völter, and on the other hand § 35, 1, note 2), which Clement of Alex. already finds foretold in Jude (*Strom.*, 3, 2). But it is clear that the fundamental principle of the libertinism here attacked, as shown in our Epistle (No. 2), is the exact contrary of gnostic dualism in which such gnosis had its root. Moreover it is purely imaginative to find a rejection of the world's Creator and Lawgiver together with the angels who serve Him in vers. 4 and 8, which only refer to a practical denial of the κυριότης of Christ; and an allusion to "the decaying faith of the Church" in the emphasizing of the traditional faith in vers. 3, 20. Comp. on the other hand Spitta, *ibid.*

§ 39. The Apostle Peter.

1. Simon, or Simeon (Acts xv. 14; comp. 2 Pet. i. 1, according to the Hebrew, Shimeon), the son of one Jona (Matt. xvi. 17), appears in ancient tradition as a fisher on the Lake of Gennesareth, who with Andrew his (apparently younger) brother, dwelt in Capernaum (Mark i. 16, 29). The way in which his mother-in-law is mentioned on the occasion of Jesus' visit to their house (i. 30 f.), makes it not improbable that at that time he was already a widower; yet he must afterwards have married again (1 Cor. ix. 5), although the συνεκλεκτή of 1 Pet. v. 13 is no more his wife (in opposition to Neander) than the Mark there named is his actual son. At the beginning of His Messianic work in Galilee Jesus had first called the two brothers to be his constant companions (Mark i. 17 f.); or according to another tradition chiefly and in the first place Simon (Luke v. 10), expressly

requiring him to exchange his fisherman's calling for a higher one. He is always named first, not only in the list of the Apostles (Mark iii. 16), but also in the circle of Jesus' three confidential friends (v. 37; ix. 2; xiii. 3; xiv. 33); he is addressed by Jesus rather than the rest (xiv. 37) and appears also on other occasions to be regarded as the chief of the disciples (xvi. 7; comp. Matt. xvii. 24). Jesus had given him the distinguishing name of Peter (Mark iii. 16); and how He meant it is shown from the statement, certainly drawn from earliest tradition, that on the basis of the rocky nature expressed in this name Jesus expected him permanently to found the Church of the Messiah (Matt. xvi. 18).[1] Jesus seems to be thinking of Simon when in answer to the request of the sons of Zebedee for the highest places of honour in His kingdom, He says they are not His to give, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται (Mark x. 40), viz. by God Himself according to their gifts and calling, as Matt. x. 23 correctly explains. Even after His resurrection Jesus distinguished him by appearing to him specially and apparently first (Luke xxiv. 34; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 5).

In the fourth Gospel the name of the father of the two brethren is said to be Ἰωάννης (John i. 43; comp. xxi. 15–17). The fact that Bethsaida is spoken of as the city of Andrew and Peter (i. 44), *i.e.* the city of their birth and original home, is naturally not inconsistent with the presumption that they had afterwards, in pursuit of their trade, settled in Capernaum. Andrew there appears as a disciple of the Baptist (i. 40); whereas Simon had probably come to the Jordan only for the purpose of being baptized, when Andrew met him there and made him acquainted with Jesus in whom he had found the Messiah (i. 41 f.). The narrative of his having been called at the Sea of Galilee, far from being in contradiction with this, would be quite unintelligible except on the hypothesis of such previous acquaintance. That Jesus gave him the name of Peter

[1] On the contrary the giving of the power of the keys in the sense of Isa. xxii. 22, *i.e.* of the chief direction and oversight of the house of the Divine kingdom (Matt. xvi. 19) manifestly rests on a later application of the words of Matt. xviii. 18 specially to him, in keeping with the position which in fact he occupied for a very long period in the Church.

at this first meeting (i. 42) is not inconsistent with Matt. xvi. 18, where Jesus only alludes to the character implied in such a designation.[2] At the close of the Gospel the supreme authority in the Church which Peter had forfeited by his fall, as the probationary question put to him shows, seems to have been made over to him again only after the resurrection of Jesus (John xxi. 15–17).

2. Peter was of a rash nature. Quick to resolve, we find him first among the Apostles on every occasion, in speech as well as in action. It is he who in the name of the Twelve confesses the Messiahship of Jesus (Mark viii. 29; comp. John vi. 69), and suggests the reward which they think they earned by their fidelity (Mark x. 28). The later Gospels also, as a rule, make him spokesman for the disciples (Matt. xv. 15; xviii. 21; Luke viii. 45; xii. 41). Just as in Mark xiv. 54 he alone follows Jesus into the palace of the high priest, so the fourth Gospel represents him as the first resolutely to examine the sepulchre on Easter morning; and on seeing the risen One, to throw himself into the sea, in order to be first with Jesus (John xx. 6; xxi. 7 ff.). Lightly stirred by every impulse that affected his susceptible nature, he was hurried into thoughtless speech and action. He presumes to reproach the Lord when for the first time He speaks of His passion (Mark viii. 32); and proposes to build tabernacles on the mount of transfiguration (ix. 5). Just in the same way the fourth Gospel depicts him as first hastily refusing to have his feet washed, and

[2] Mark certainly seems to have the idea that this name was given to him at the time when the apostolic circle was constituted (iii. 14 f.); but this is in itself very improbable, since the moment in question had no special significance whatever for Simon, who had been called by Jesus long before into His service; and the idea probably originated only in the fact that it was in the apostolic circle that Simon, whom Jesus alone seems to have called by this name (Mark xiv. 37; Luke xxii. 31; Matt. xvii. 25; John xxi. 15–17), first bore the name thus given to him by Jesus. Paul speaks of him exclusively as Cephas, or Peter (Gal. ii. 7 f.) as he calls himself (1 Pet. i. 1). It is in the Gospels that we first meet with the name of Simon Peter, in addition to Peter alone (Matt. xvi. 16; Luke v. 8; comp. Acts x. 5; 2 Pet. i. 1).

then, when the Lord makes participation with Himself dependent on this act, asking for more than Jesus offers him (John xiii. 6–9). It is he moreover who is represented as thoughtlessly using his sword in Gethsemane (xviii. 10). He fails in his promise to remain true to the Lord even to death though all should be offended with Him (Mark xiv. 29–31, comp. John xiii. 37); and denies Him in the court of the high priest (Mark xiv. 66–72).[1] So too the narrative of the first Gospel, describing the rash courage with which he tries to go through the sea to Jesus, and then, no sooner perceives the storm than he despairs and begins to sink (Matt. xiv. 28–31), pourtrays his character in a way that cannot be surpassed. Again we find him acting against a conviction strengthened by long practice, because the coming of messengers from Jerusalem made him apprehensive lest he should be suspected as an apostate from the law of the fathers (Gal. ii. 11–13; comp. § 14, 6). Only He who is unequalled in knowledge of the heart could have detected in this apparently contradictory nature, so open to varying impulses, the rocky heart which, when fully developed, gave the right direction to his energetic nature, and combined self-sacrificing endurance with his rash initiative.

3. In the circle of the disciples, assembled at Jerusalem after the departure of Jesus, Peter at once takes his place

[1] The account given in the fourth Gospel (John xviii. 16–18; xxv. 27), first makes this occurrence fully clear and comprehensible. It is only when the maid by her untimely question exposes him to the danger of losing the access he had luckily gained to the high priest's palace, that he gives an evasive answer which is already half a lie. Then when a second question threatens to make him a laughing-stock to the rude servants and to reveal him as a liar, he gets more and more deeply involved in untruth; and when finally the discovery of his rash act of violence exposes him to personal danger he is led to confirm his lie by an oath. The crowing of the cock first reminds him that in his self-forgetting rashness he has uttered the very denial that in his love for Jesus he had deemed entirely impossible.

as the leading personality, suggesting the choice of an Apostle in the place of Judas (Acts i. 15 ff.). Thousands were converted at the feast of Pentecost by his appearing and discourse, and were added to the first Church of the Messiah by means of the baptism that he required (chap. ii.). It was by his discourse after the healing of the lame man that he first drew down upon himself the enmity of the chief council (chaps. iii., iv.); and on the occasion of his second conflict with them he speaks in the name of the Apostles (v. 29). He purifies the Church from the scandal it had incurred through Ananias and Sapphira, by unmasking their deception (v. 1–11). He visits the newly-founded churches in Samaria and on the Phœnician coast; on which occasion he is induced to baptize the first Gentile (chaps. viii.–x.). At Paul's first visit to Jerusalem, he is so distinctly the head of the primitive Church, that Paul desires only to make acquaintance with him (Gal. i. 18); and after the execution of James the son of Zebedee, it is chiefly against him that Herod's enmity is directed (Acts xii. 3 f.). Whither he turned after his release from imprisonment, we do not know (xii. 7); the only certain thing is that from that time James the brother of the Lord took his place at the head of the primitive Church (§ 36, 1). We meet with him again at the so-called Apostolic Council in Jerusalem, where although he is the first to speak, it is evident that he no longer occupies the leading place (Acts xv. 7; comp. Gal. ii. 9). Soon afterwards we find him in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11); and at Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, he is manifestly no longer there (Acts xxi. 17 ff.). It is absolutely inconceivable that a man of such powerful initiative should have confined his activity to Judea or Jerusalem, especially after another had actually assumed the leadership in that place. The way in which Paul speaks of him as qualified for the ἀποστολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς in opposition to himself (Gal. ii. 8). is only intelligible on the assumption that

Peter had made missionary journeys to the Jewish Diaspora his chief work; and Paul treats it as a fact well known to the Corinthians that he went about with his wife on journeys of this kind (1 Cor. ix. 5). We have indeed no certain historical information as to where he went; apart from the conclusion that may be drawn from his first Epistle.[1]

4. It is at all events credibly attested that Peter came also to Rome towards the end of his life. The probability is so great, that Clement of Rome supposes his martyrdom to have taken place there (ad Cor. v. 4); he does not directly state this however, and it is dangerous to conclude from the words of Ignatius, οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν (ad Rom. iv. 3) that both Apostles laboured in Rome. On the other hand the account of Peter's abode in Rome has since the last quarter of the second century assumed definiteness of form, though manifestly in connection with the claim of the Roman Church to have been founded by the two chief Apostles Peter and Paul in common. It is true that what Dionysius of Corinth (ap. Euseb., *H.E.*, 2, 25) says of a planting of Churches in Corinth and Rome by both in common, is by himself virtually reduced to a διδάσκειν on their part in the two places; but Caius of Rome already speaks (*ibid.*) of the two Apostles who *founded* the Church, and Irenæus refers to the time when

[1] Eusebius' statement (*H. E.*, 3, 1) that he seems to have preached to the Jews of the Diaspora in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia—as to which it is entirely a matter of indifference whether the later appeal to Origen refers likewise to this utterance—is unquestionably based entirely on 1 Pet. i. 1 (comp. *H. E.*, 3, 4); however confidently repeated by Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 1) and Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 27). The fable of his bishopric at Antioch is also an inference from Gal. ii. 11. On the other hand there is much to be said in favour of the supposition that on his missionary journeys he came also to Corinth (§ 19, 4, note 2). The idea that this would be at variance with the agreement come to in Gal. ii. 9, rests on a total misunderstanding of the passage (§ 14, 5, note 2).

they preached the Gospel there and founded the Church (*adv. Hær.*, IV. 3, 1, comp. 3, 2, 3). Among the Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ Tertullian esteems the Roman one specially happy, "cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt" (*De Præscr. Hær.*, 36). Nevertheless the assumption that the idea of Peter's abode in Rome only originated in a desire to unite the two Apostles in a peaceful relation and to give Peter a share in the great work of the Gentile Apostle, for the purpose of doing away with the primitive-Christian opposition between them (comp. Baur, *Tüb. Zeitschr. f. Theol.*, 1831, 4; 1836, 3), is wholly untenable. The natural way in which the two Apostles are associated in Clement of Rome and Ignatius entirely excludes all presumption of such tendency; since the former says nothing whatever of the two Apostles *working* together, while the latter does not expressly state that both worked personally *in Rome*. Above all we find in Clement of Alexandria the assumption of Peter's abode in Rome solely in connection with an entirely artless statement respecting the composition of Mark's Gospel, that has nothing whatever to do with such tendencies and is confirmed by Papias (ap. Euseb. 3, 39) out of the mouth of the Presbyter (John), as also by the character of the Gospel itself.[1]

Following a later development of Baur's view, Lipsius (*die Quellen der röm. Petrussage*, Kiel, 1872, comp. also *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1876, 4) and Holtzmann (in Schenkel's *B.-Lex.*, IV., 1872) in particular have endeavoured to interpret the Catholic form of the tradition about the

[1] Since Eusebius (*H. E.*, 6, 14) himself quotes the passage from Clement's *Hypotyposes*, in which the latter appeals to the tradition of the old presbyters, it is entirely arbitrary to represent his own utterance in ii. 15 as an appeal to Clement in favour of what had been said respecting Simon, or in confirmation of his false interpretation of 1 Pet. v. 13. Just as little does he appeal to Papias in favour of Mark's Gospel having been composed in Rome, which was quite impossible after the passage he quotes from him in 3, 39; although it is probable that the tradition in Papias supposes the Apostle to have written in Rome.

common abode of the two Apostles in Rome as a later distortion of the original anti-Pauline tradition in which Peter under the form of Simon Magus pursues the Apostle Paul to Rome in order to attack and vanquish him there. (Comp. on the other hand Hilgenfeld, *Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1872, 3; 77, 4; Joh. Delitzsch, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1874, 2). But the Jewish-Christian fable in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions looks for the scene of this struggle, consistently with the origin of the idea (§ 14, 6), chiefly in Antioch; while the tradition of Peter's sojourn at Rome, which again meets us in Clement's Epistle to James (chap. i) without any reference to the struggle with the magician, was only made use of afterwards for the further extension of the Clementine romance (comp. *Const. Apost.*, vi. 8).[2] Side by side with this we find also in the *Prædicatio Petri* the idea that the two Apostles first made acquaintance in Rome; and as in it, so too in the *Acta Petri et Pauli* we have the tradition of Peter's sojourn at Rome without any mention of his conflict with the magician in either. That this event is afterwards transferred to Rome is in keeping with the account of Justin, according to which Simon is said to have come to Rome under Claudius and to have been worshipped there as a God (*Apol.*, I. 26).[3] It was Eusebius who first combined Justin's account with the Clementine attack on Simon Magus by Peter, of which Justin, Irenæus and Tertullian are still ignorant, and which without perceiving its tendency he takes for actual history, as Hippolytus had already done (*Philos.*, vi. 20), making out that Simon was pursued to Rome by Peter, who therefore came to Rome as early as the second year of Claudius (comp. *H. E.*, 2, 14 and his *Chron.*); on which basis Jerome then founded Peter's twenty-five years' bishopric in Rome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 1). On this is built up the whole Roman tradition, still defended by Windischmann (*Vindiciæ*

---

[2] The Tübingen school, whose view on this point has been indefatigably defended especially by Lipsius (comp. Schenkel, *Bibellex.*, v.), finds even in Acts viii. a Catholic distortion of the anti-Pauline tradition which stamped Simon first as the representative of Paulinism, and then of Gnosticism. Comp. on the other hand Ritschl, Delitzsch, A. Harnack (*Zur Quellenkritik d. Gesch. d. Gnosticismus*, Leipzig, 1873), Mangold, and lastly Hilgenfeld himself (*Ketzergesch. d. Urchristenthums*, Leipzig, 1884).

[3] It has long been shown that this statement is simply an error, since it is connected with a statue dedicated to the Sabine-Roman deity Semo Sancus, the inscription of which was incorrectly read by Justin as Simoni Sancto. Since therefore this has no connection whatever with the Jewish-Christian fable which represents Paul as having been pursued under the mask of Simon Magus by Peter, Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, I. 23, 1), and Tertullian (*De Anima*, 34) borrow it from Justin without connecting it in any way with Peter's sojourn in Rome.

Petrinæ, Ratisb., 1836); whereas it has been abandoned even by Catholic theologians such as Ellendorf (*Ist Petrus in Rom. Gewesen?* Darmstadt, 1841. Comp. § 22, 2).[4]

5. A hint of the martyrdom of Peter, though not of his crucifixion, is already found in a prophetic utterance of Jesus, by the author of John xxi. 18 f. who therefore assumes it as a well-known fact; but that he suffered this martyrdom in Rome is not at least directly stated by Clement of Rome (No. 4), nor does the Muratorian Canon, which somewhere speaks of the passion of Peter, make any definite statement as to place and time. On the other hand Caius of Rome pledges himself to show, even at his time, the τρόπαια of the two Apostles; but even the ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν of Dionysius of Corinth (ap. Euseb., *H.E.*, 2, 25) is not to be taken in a strictly chronological sense. It is with Irenæus that the ἔξοδος of the two Apostles first forms an express designation of time (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1); but here as in the account of Dionysius it is quite enough to assume the latter time of Nero in general. We are as little entitled to draw from 1 Clem. ad Cor. vi. 1 the indirect conclusion that it was in the massacre of the year 64 that both Apostles perished, as to conclude from Tertullian's statement that they died under Nero (*Scorpiace*, 15). That Paul is said to have been executed with the sword in distinction from Peter (*De Præscr. Hær.*, 36: "ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu

[4] The Protestant polemic against this view already begins with U. Velenus (*Liber quo Petrum Romam non venisse asseritur*, 1520, Frcf., 1631); and reasons for it are put together by Fr. Spanheim, *de ficta profectione Petri ap. in urbem Romam*, Lugd. Bat., 1679. But recent theologians also in giving up the Roman fiction of the founding of the Church by Peter and of his twenty-five years' episcopate in Rome, have thrown doubt on the trustworthy tradition of Peter's sojourn (and martyrdom) in that city (comp. Neander and Winer); or have disputed it, as for example Eichhorn, who derives it from a false interpretation of 1 Pet. v. 13, Hase, de Wette, Mayerhoff (*Einl. in die petr. Schriften*, Hamburg, 1835), and Gundert (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1869, 2).

coronatur"), is on the contrary an argument against such assumption; since the Apostle would hardly in those days of horror have been protected from the death of a slave by his Roman citizenship (comp. § 26, 6).[1] It was Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 1) who first made them die on the same day. It is even by no means improbable that Peter came to Rome only after Paul's death; though the hypothesis that he did not wish to appear as an intruder into his field of labour can hardly be taken to prove this (as Mangold maintains), since we have no knowledge whatever of the circumstances that led him to Rome. The martyrdom of Peter in Rome has been adhered to by Olshausen (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1838, 4), Gieseler and Niedner, Credner and Bleek, Ewald and Weizsäcker (*Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1876, 2), Mangold, and even Hilgenfeld (comp. *Zeitschr. f. w. Theol.*, 1876, 1; 77, 4). Compare finally Sieffert (ap. Herzog, *R.-Enc.*, xi. 1883).

§ 40. The First Epistle of Peter.

1. The Epistle characterizes its readers as those who by virtue of their election to be partakers in the fulness of Divine salvation, are strangers here upon earth, but at the same time designates them as belonging to the Diaspora of Asia Minor (more definitely of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, i. 1). According to this the readers can only be regarded as Messiah-believing Jews.[1] Consistently

[1] Tertullian's statement as to the mode of Peter's death looks very like a (false) interpretation of John xxi. 18 f., while suspicion is first thrown on the assertion of Origen that he was crucified κατὰ κεφαλῆς, *i.e.* with his head down (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 1), by Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 1) who moreover in direct opposition to Tert. *De præscr. hær.*, 36, treats it as a mark of humility on the part of the Apostle who would not put himself on an equality with his Lord.

[1] Even if the ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ in James i. 1 could be a mere ethnographical delineation (§ 37, 1, note 1), any other interpretation is here made quite impossible by the circumstance that the genitive of the names of the countries (comp. John vii. 35) can only apply to those

with this we have the circumstance that passages from the Old Testament (such as i. 16; ii. 6), are not only incidentally quoted, as often happens with Paul even when speaking to Gentile Christians, but that much more frequent allusion is made to Old Testament passages in a way that presupposes their familiarity and currency with the readers; since it is only on this assumption that such allusions reach their object (comp. in particular i. 24 f.; ii. 3 f.; vii. 9 f. 22–25; iii. 10–12, 14; iv. 8, 17 f.; v. 5, 7). In many cases the language also presupposes an understanding of Old Testament usages, ideas and narratives, with which the Gentile Christians cannot be credited to the same extent (comp. i. 2, 10 ff., 19; ii. 5, 24; iii. 5 f., 20).[2] From the circumstance that the Apostle in addressing the Jewish-Christian Churches bears preliminary testimony by his word to the truth of the grace of God made known to them (v. 13);

districts where the Jewish community to which the readers belonged was scattered. The very characterization of their Christian state by ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι makes it quite impossible to interpret the genitive διασπορᾶς only as an analogous designation of such state; in which case moreover it would after all be applied in an entirely arbitrary way to external dispersion as opposed to inner relationship (v. Soden, *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1883, 3), unless we introduce references which are entirely inapplicable to Gentile Christians (comp. Holtzmann). It is quite impossible to go with Mangold, who finds himself forced to acknowledge the proper signification of διασπορά, in also explaining παρεπίδημοι literally and from a Jewish-Christian standpoint, making the Gentile Christians only associates of Jewish Christians in the Diaspora; as the parallel expression in i. 17; ii. 11 shows.

[2] This view, though current, seems to us to be historically inconceivable, and to go far beyond the Pauline transference of the theocratic predicates of Israel to the Christian Church as such; it is a *quid pro quo* by means of which the fact that believing Israel is in ii. 7–9 called the chosen race (γένος—ἔθνος) in consequence of the Divine foreknowledge (i. 2) in opposition to those who were rejected on account of unbelief, is concealed. So too it is owing to a prevalent, but verbally impossible misinterpretation of ii. 25, that we fail to see how the readers are there designated in prophetic phraseology as sheep that have gone astray from the fold of the true theocracy and are now brought back to Jehovah their Shepherd (comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 11 ff., 16).

whereas no trace of Jewish Christian errors by which the Churches were disturbed is anywhere to be found in our Epistle (as assumed by Neander, Credner, Guericke, Bleek and again by L. Schulze without any foundation in the Epistle), it is clear that those who preached the Gospel to them (i. 12, 15) were not Apostles, and hence that we have to do with Messiah-believing conventicles in the Diaspora of Asia Minor, which owing to frequent intercourse with the fatherland, had arisen naturally by means of the Propaganda of the Palestinian primitive Church, though without premeditation. The current assertion that we have no knowledge of such Jewish-Christian Churches in Asia Minor, is entirely unmeaning; since apart from what the Acts narrate of the Pauline mission and what the Pauline Epistles presuppose, we know virtually nothing regarding the spread of Christianity. On the contrary we have seen that Paul's journey through Asia Minor (§ 15, 2), as also the Galatian and Ephesian Epistles (§ 18, 1; 25, 6) already presuppose the existence of such Jewish-Christian Churches, which moreover are known even to the Apocalypse (§ 35, 2). That individual believers among the heathen had attached themselves to these Churches, though possible, cannot be proved; in any case it could not interfere with the presumption that believing Israel formed the proper substance of the Christian Churches.

Notwithstanding the fact that in accordance with the precedent set by the Patristic expositors with scarcely an exception, all earlier critics, rightly interpreting the address, adhered to the view of Jewish-Christian readers (comp. Augusti, *kath. Briefe*, 1801; Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug), admitting at most an intermixture of Gentile Christians (as done by Schott and Jachmann in his Commentary, 1838, Winer and L. Schulze, after the example of Calvin), the view that the readers were Gentile-Christian has after the example of Augustine, Luther, Wetstein since Guericke's *Beitr.* (1828) and Steiger's *Kommentar.* (1832) become the prevailing one; Michaelis, Credner and Neudecker are alone in supposing them to have been proselytes, as suggested by the Venerable Bede. It was thought that i. 14, 18, and especially iv. 3 contained an

allusion to the former Gentile sinful life of the readers, without regard to the fact that it would not be the least surprising if the Jews in the Diaspora without, were still more infected by the heathen social life that surrounded them than the τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί of Galilee with whom the Gospels make us acquainted (comp. also Rom. ii. 1 ff.; Eph. ii. 3; Tit. iii. 3); and that these passages in many respects prove the very contrary of that which they are said to prove.[3] But it is quite at variance with the context in behalf of this view to make i. 21 refer to conversion to monotheism, i. 25 to the extension of Old Testament Scripture to former heathen, and ii. 10 in opposition to the original sense of the passage Hos. ii. 32 to the adoption of Gentiles, instead of to the re-adoption of Israel who had obtained mercy in Christ, because Paul thus interpreted the passage in Hosea. Finally, it is inconceivable how iii. 6 can be regarded as a proof that the readers were Gentiles, because they had only *become* children of Sara, a statement which certainly can be taken only in a metaphorical sense (for the very reason that it appears as dependent on their ἀγαθοποιεῖν), for in this the highest honour for born Jewesses consisted. The true conception, inevitably following from the address, has since Weiss (*petr. Lehrbegr.*, Berlin, 1858; *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1865, 4; 1873, 3) been only of late acknowledged again by Beyschlag (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1857, 4) and Schenkel.

2. It is certain that the existence of such essentially Jewish-Christian Churches in Asia Minor presupposes that the Epistle belongs to an early time, before Gentile Christianity had (after 55 or 56, comp. § 18, 7, Note 2) neces-

[3] If the ἄγνοια to which in i. 14 their former lusts are traced back, is by no means necessarily heathen ignorance of the Divine will, but may be a defective understanding of this will which they endeavoured to satisfy by the outward fulfilling of the law; and if i. 18 contains no reference whatever to the vanity of worshipping idols, but to a walk which had power over them by very virtue of the tradition of their fathers; it is quite clear that when in iv. 3 the readers are reproached with having wrought the will of the Gentiles in their *pre-Christian* life, they themselves cannot have been heathen. The plural εἰδωλολατρ. cannot possibly denote the actual worship of idols, but participation in idolatrous works; for example the eating of flesh offered to idols, taking part in sacrificial meals (comp. Rom. ii. 22), which by the addition of ἀθεμίτοις are shown to have been practised by those to whom they were expressly forbidden. Moreover it is hard to understand how those who interpret Rom. xiii. 13 as having been written to Jewish Christians (§ 22, 3) can find this passage irreconcilable with the Jewish-Christian address.

sarily gained ascendency in Asia Minor by Paul's Gentile-Apostolic ministry proceeding from Ephesus. We are brought to the same time by the fact that there is no mention as yet of the legal question, which, as the Galatian disturbances show, must instantly have become a burning one when the Pauline creations came into contact with the earlier Jewish-Christian foundations (§ 18, 1).[1] The fact that the Churches had already presbyters (v. 1) is not enough to relegate this Epistle any more than that of James (§ 37, 3) to a later time; especially as v. 5 shows that besides these there was no second office in the Church, but that those who were younger in years (οἱ νεώτεροι, comp. Acts v. 6, 10) rendered any inferior services that might be necessary, subordinate to the Presbyters, just as in the earliest period of the primitive Church. The designation of the readers as ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη (ii. 2) expressly indicates that they had but recently been converted, for it would have sufficed in conjunction with the figure of the milk there employed to have called them νήπιοι (1 Cor. iii. 1 f.; Heb. v. 13); and it fully agrees with this, that the troubles which they had to endure in their Christian state still appeared strange to them, as being new and unexpected (iv. 12), inasmuch as the approach of the Messianic time seemed to afford them a prospect of the greatest happiness. These troubles seemed primarily to consist in the fact that the readers were reproached by their former countrymen for the name of Christ (iv. 14); and only in this connection does it cease to appear strange that the Apostle should exhort them

[1] Although this by no means proves that our Epistle does not belong to the time previous to the Apostolic council (comp. § 37, 3, note 1), neither does it prove that it belongs to a time when the above question may be regarded as having been solved; for at this time, as we see from the Colossian and Pastoral Epistles, doctrinal errors of an entirely different nature disturbed the Churches of Asia Minor, of which Th. Schott alone (*Komm.*, 1861) has been able to discover some trace in our Epistle.

not to bring suffering on themselves by their sins, but to glorify God by the way in which they suffered ὡς Χριστιανοί (iv. 15 f). It is certain that their relation to the heathen world by which they were surrounded is already taken into consideration in a way that is not done in the Epistle of James; but even here (iv. 4) we find that the heathen regarded it as strange that they no longer took part in their immoral life and conduct (comp. No. 1, note 2), and on this account spoke evil of them, reviling (iii. 9) and slandering them (ii. 15). The Apostle again gives expression to the hope that they may cease from their slander which is founded on ignorance, and may themselves on the contrary be won over to the gospel on a closer acquaintance with the good works to which the Christians are brought by their new faith (ii. 12; iii. 16); a hope which certainly could not have been expressed after a long continuance of Christianity in the Gentile world.[2] It is entirely erroneous to

[2] If the manifold afflictions spoken of in i. 6 are only hypothetical (comp. iii. 14, 17) and if v. 9 expressly gives prominence to the fact that their sufferings are only such as all Christians are subject to, the theory that our Epistle presupposes a time of special persecution is excluded. A παθεῖν σαρκί is only spoken of in iv. 1 by way of contrast with the sufferings of Christ; and that the ἀπολογία in iii. 15 does not refer to lawsuits before heathen tribunals, is clear from the fact that it is the giving an account of their Christian hope that is there spoken of. Hence the idea that has gained currency since Eichhorn, Hug, de Wette, Neander and Ewald, viz. that it refers to the persecution of the year 64 under Nero, which had altogether local grounds and of whose extension beyond Rome we know nothing whatever, is quite untenable. Even Schleiermacher perceived that the passage commonly adduced in favour of this view (Tac., *Ann.*, 15, 44), and according to which the Christians were at that time held up to the hatred of the people as the *odium humani generis* and *per flagitia invisi*, proves on the contrary that the slanders, of which our Epistle still entertains a hope that they might be disproved by the fact, had attained their aim; and when Suetonius on that occasion calls the Christians a *genus hominum superstitiosæ et maleficæ* (*Nero*, 16), the κακοποιοί of our Epistle used in a purely moral sense has nothing whatever to do with this. On the other hand ii. 14 would hardly have been written in the latter time of Nero without limitation. Hence the above combination has also been rejected by Berthold, Schott, Credner,

lay such stress on the sufferings of the readers (as done by Th. Schott and Sieffert, Herzog, *R.-Enc.*, XI., 1833, but especially by the later school of critics, as Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, v Soden and Holtzmann) as to make the whole Epistle, which is purely hortatory (comp. Keil, *Komm.*, 1883) appear to be a writing intended to console them on this account, and in particular to be a confirmation to them of the truth of salvation (v. 12); whereas it is absolutely inconceivable how suffering should have misled them as to the saving facts of Christ's passion and exaltation so strongly emphasized in our Epistle.

The view that the Epistle is addressed to the Gentile-Christian Churches of Asia Minor which were founded by the ministry of Paul (No. 1), already requires that it be put down to the later Pauline time or even beyond it. The chief motive for this is to be found in the view that has gained prevalence particularly since Dan. Schulze (*der schriftstellerische Werth und Charakter des Petrus*, etc., Leipzig, 1820, *und des Johannes*, Leipzig, 1811), viz., that the Epistle rests in the most complete way on the Pauline Epistles, consisting almost entirely of reminiscences of them. It is true that Rauch (in Winer u. Engelhardt's *kritischem Journal*, VIII., 1828), Mayerhoff (*Einl. in d. petrin. Schriften*, Hamb., 1835), Jachmann and B. Brückner dispute any such relation; but Weiss showed that it was incontrovertible at least with respect to the Roman and Ephesian Epistles, since which time it has for the most part been virtually limited to these two Epistles (comp. also Sieffert).[3] But

---

Reuss, Guericke and commentators like Steiger and Brückner (1865) as very uncertain or quite inappropriate (comp. against this Mangold and v. Soden, *ibid.*).

[3] Holtzman has extended it once more to all the Pauline Epistles; but the uncritical heaping up of parallels in his Introduction affords no confirmation of his allegation. It is quite an error to assert that the whole groundwork of the Epistle is Pauline. It is true the invocation of a blessing is likewise detached here from the address of the Epistle, but this is by no means exclusively Pauline (§ 16, 4, note 1); 1 Peter on the other hand is quite unique in its use of πλῆθυνθείη (i. 2), and has the Jewish farewell greeting in place of the Pauline benediction (v. 14). Instead of beginning with the Pauline thanksgiving for the state of the readers, the Epistle commences by praise of the Divine acts of salvation; and the way in which the didactic and hortatory elements, instead of being separated are closely interwoven throughout, is characteristically distinct from all the Paulines.

though Sieffert makes out that our Epistle is an almost verbatim copy of the Roman one (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1874, 3), and Holtzmann finds reminiscences of the Roman one in i. 2, 4 f., 24; iii. 4, 18; iv. 1, it has already been proved by Weiss that the actual parallels between the two Epistles are limited exclusively to Rom. xii. 13; and the manifest impossibility that a writer so didactic as the author of our Epistle, should, if acquainted with the Roman Epistle, have remembered only this least characteristic chapter, makes it imperative to reverse the relation (§ 23, 6). That this view should hitherto have "met with universal condemnation," as stated by Holtzmann (but comp. *die Anzeige von Beyschlag, Stud. u. Krit.*, 1857, 4), rests solely on the totally unfounded prejudice that Paul's originality as an author is thus in some way compromised. On the other hand the dependence of the Ephesian Epistle (assuming, however, its spuriousness), on this one is universally recognised by the latest criticism (§ 25, 6); while Seiffert (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1881, 1, 2) even inclines to ascribe both to the same author. The relation of our Epistle to that of the Hebrews, emphasized by Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, v. Soden and others can be explained without any such dependence, if the doctrinal character of the latter be rightly understood (§ 30, 4). The assumed dependence on the Epistle of James is excluded by a right conception of the relation (§ 37, 3, note 3).

3. The very way the readers are characterized in the address, which is most peculiar, points to a heavenly destination for the elect strangers and to their call to be obedient, on which the whole Epistle turns (i. 1 f.). Consistently with this the Epistle begins with praise of God for the hope of a heavenly inheritance revealed and in every way secured to the readers by the resurrection of Christ (i. 3–5), an inheritance which far from being obscured, is only enhanced by all the afflictions of the present (i. 6–9), and which rests on the firm foundation of the salvation already obtained but which was only seen by the prophets in the future (i. 10–12). Immediately attached to the fundamental idea of this introduction, we have in i. 13 the *first* series of exhortations, enjoining on the readers a holy walk in the fear of God (i. 14–21), unfeigned, steadfast love of the brethren (i. 22–25), and genuine growth in salvation; by which means they may be joined to the true people of God

in whom the Old Testament promise is fulfilled (ii. 1–10).[1] With a second allusion to the alien position of believers in the world, the Epistle passes on to the *second* series of exhortations, in which it treats of their relation to the surrounding world with its ordinances (ii. 11 f.) and in particular to the relation of all to the heathen rulers (ii. 13–17); as for example, of slaves to Gentile masters (ii. 18–25), and of women to unbelieving husbands (iii. 1–6); to which is attached an exhortation to converted husbands as to the right conduct towards their wives (iii. 7). With a glance at the Christian mind in general, the author goes on to show how Christians amid their hostile surroundings are not to suffer themselves to be enticed to evil, but by perseverance in well-doing to overcome such hostility (iii. 8–16); and this leads him to a detailed statement with regard to the blessing connected with suffering borne in this way (iii. 17–iv. 6).[2] Reminding them that the end is at hand, the Epistle finally

[1] In i. 18 f. the exhortation is already supported by a reference to the efficacy of Christ's death to redeem from the bondage of sin; and in i. 21 we are again reminded that Christian hope is confirmed by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. The author then proceeds to show in i. 23 ff. how regeneration is effected by the Gospel-word bearing the same character as the Old Testament word of revelation, of which the exalted Lord Himself forms the substance (ii. 2 f.); and how it is only by adherence to him that believers can attain the end of their calling (ii. 4 ff.).

[2] As in ii. 21–25, in connection with the sufferings of Christian slaves, we have a detailed description of the typical and salutary character of the suffering of Christ, so in iii. 17–22 it is shown how the suffering of Christ (the δίκαιος) has not only had the effect of leading us into full communion with God, but as a further consequence has also entitled Him to preach salvation to the worst sinners of the past. Having by His resurrection entered into glory, He is also able to deliver all believers from the counterpart of the judgment inflicted in the flood, by which they formerly perished. Hence they are to bear in mind the blessed fruit of the suffering that separates them from the sins of an ungodly world, which, as is shown by Christ's preaching to the dead, directly foreshadows the definitive judgment on the living and the dead (iv. 1–6).

passes on to the *third* series of exhortations referring to the life of the Christian community, where the first requirement is a constant state of prayerfulness such as this nearness demands, and secondly the manifestation of love in forgiveness, in hospitality and in the mutual service of all gifts of speech and labour (iv. 8–11). Although the author then apparently goes back to the sufferings of Christians, his point of view is an entirely different one here from that of iii. 9–16. For the question turns mainly on the point as to how the Church should bear the sufferings arising from the confession of Christ so as to glorify God thereby and to be preserved in the judgment coming upon them through these trials (iv. 12–19); so that even here the hortatory point of view entirely outweighs the consolatory. Then follows the exhortation to a right administration of Church offices and humble submission thereto (v. 1–5). The final exhortation demands humble and trusting submission under God's hand, with vigilance, in order by faith to overcome the Satanic temptation involved in the sufferings of the present; concluding with the invocation of a blessing (v. 6–11) followed by the epistolary ending (v. 12–14).

4. The Epistle, already known to Clement, Polycarp and Papias (§ 6, 7) belongs to the New Testament in the character of a Petrine composition as early as the end of the 2nd century (§ 9, 5); and from the time of Origen and Eusebius is rightly counted with the Homologumena (§ 10, 7; 11, 3); nor can it possibly have been wanting originally in the Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 3). The author calls himself an Apostle of Jesus Christ (i. 1) and a witness of His sufferings (v. 1); although he is so far from laying claim to apostolic authority that in the latter passage he only speaks of himself as a co-elder of the elders of the Church. In keeping with this self-testimony of the Epistle is its most prominent peculiarity, on account of which the author has frequently since Steiger been designated with justice the

Apostle of hope. The rash nature of the Apostle (§ 39, 2) led him from the beginning to direct all the energy of their longing and striving to the promised final consummation, and hence to find the highest good and deepest motive of all Christian life in the lively hope which anticipates as it were this end with joyful certainty.[1] In like manner we recognise the Apostle of the circumcision not only in his prevailing dependence on the Old Testament with its words, narratives and institutions (No. 1), but also in the way in which the believing Church is admonished to realize the ideal of Israel in becoming God's own people, God's house and priesthood, God's flock (ii. 9 f.; ii. 5; iv. 17; v. 2 f.); in the way in which as the servants of God, fearing and obeying Him (ii. 16 f., comp. i. 17; i. 2, 14) they are to separate themselves from those who on account of their disobedience fall into perdition (ii. 7 f.; iii. 1; iv. 17), trusting in God as a faithful creator, and walking in holiness before Him as the impartial judge (iv. 19; i. 17). But although the requirement of holiness is verbally reproduced from the Old Testament (ii. 15 f.), we find no insistence on ceremonial ordinances, which only come into question as fulfilled in the Church in a higher sense (ii. 5). Finally we perceive

[1] To him a lively hope is the highest gift (i. 3, 21; iii. 15) and problem (i. 13; iii 5) of Christianity; a heavenly inheritance, the standpoint from which the Christian still feels himself a stranger (i. 1, 4, 17; ii. 11); the gracious gift of (eternal) life the measure for estimating one's fellow-Christian (iii. 7); and future glory the motive of all Christian suffering and work (iv. 13; v. 4, 10). The last times have already begun with the manifestation of the Messiah fore-ordained before the foundation of the world (i. 20); the last judgment, with the second coming of Christ, is immediately at hand (i. 5, 7; iv. 5, 7; v. 4) has even already begun in the sufferings and temptations of the Christians (iv. 17), who, notwithstanding these, experience a blessed joy in hope, in which the future glory is as it were anticipated (i 8; iv. 13 f.). It is in vain that some recent expositors have tried to explain this tendency of the whole Epistle towards hope only by the suffering state of the readers; for the Epistle is by no means a letter of consolation but of exhortation (comp. No. 2).

that the author was actually one of the primitive Apostles from the vividness with which the image of Christ's innocent and suffering life is before his mind (ii. 21 ff.; comp. i. 19; iii. 18); from the way in which experience of the revolution wrought by the resurrection of Christ and His exaltation in those who witnessed them, evidently lies at the foundation of the utterances in i. 3, 21 (comp. also iii. 19; iv. 13; v. 1); from the manner in which he reflects on the loss of those who have not seen Jesus and yet have loved Him (i. 8); from the way in which he lives in reminiscences of the words of Christ,[2] while his whole doctrine is only a testimony, requiring no medium of reflection, to the acts of salvation and their effects as witnessed by himself; a fact admitted even by Ritschl and Schenkel.

It is only by putting Pauline ideas into our Epistle that it has been possible to arrive at the conclusion that it speaks Pauline doctrine throughout; and even then one is forced to admit that Paulinism has here lost its mystical depth, its polemic point and dogmatic precision (comp. last of all v. Soden), viz. that it is not Paulinism at all. Christ indeed is foreordained by God as the Redeemer before the foundation of the world (i. 20), but only as the one endowed with the Messianic Spirit already bearing witness in the prophets (i. 11) and efficacious in Him even after His death (iii. 18 f.). Notwithstanding the clear statement of His exaltation to Divine supremacy, however (iii. 22), we find as yet no

[2] There can be no question that sayings of Jesus with which we are familiar from the oldest and best authenticated traditions are re-echoed in ii. 4, 7 (Mark xii. 9 f.); ii. 17 (Mark xii. 17); iii. 14 (Matt. v. 10); iv. 14 (Matt. v. 11); v. 6 (Matt. xxiii. 12). But although the manifold peculiarity of expression forbids all thought of a use of the synoptic Gospels such as Holtzmann assumes but v. Soden limits to a few points of contact, we find an incomparably greater number of passages where, without any direct contact with synoptic utterances, the thought undoubtedly rests on words of Jesus. Thus i. 17 is unmistakably connected with the Lord's prayer in Matt. vi. 9; iii. 14 f. with Matt. x. 28; iv. 8 with Matt. xviii. 22; iv. 10 with Matt. xxv. 14 ff.; iv. 13 with Matt. x. 24 f.; v. 3 with Mark x. 42; i. 10 f. with Luke x. 24 f. On the other hand passages like ii. 12 (Matt. v. 16); i. 13 (Luke xii. 35); ii. 19 f. (Luke vi. 32–34) make us doubtful whether in these cases the Petrine tradition has not determined the form of our later Gospels.

allusion to His pre-existence. The saving significance of His death is asserted simply on the ground of an Old Testament prophecy, on which the access of sanctified man to God is made dependent (ii. 24; iii. 18); chief stress, however, being laid on its ethical effect (i. 18 f.; ii. 24 f.), proceeding from the example of His innocent and patient suffering and from reflection on His saving efficacy. The Spirit of God rests it is true on the elect, who by it are consecrated as His own in baptism (i. 2; iv. 14), but only as the Spirit of gifts of grace (i. 12; comp. iv. 10 f.); the new life of love and hope is begotten and nourished by the word of evangelical preaching which is co-equal with Old Testament Scripture (i. 23 ff.; comp. i. 3, ii. 2) and announces our being called to sonship and to eternal glory in Christ (i. 14; comp. v. 10), our redemption in Him and our future salvation guaranteed by His resurrection (i. 18, 21); but characterizes Christ as the corner stone of the completed theocracy (ii. 3 f.), predicting His second coming, which will bring their reward to those believers who have remained patient and true (i. 7; v. 4). This preaching of salvation, which, though simple, is powerful by its directness, is wanting in all the peculiarities of Pauline doctrine. Such concepts as χάρις and ἀποκάλυψις, καλεῖν and ἐκλεκτός, κληρονομία and δόξα, πίστις and δικαιοσύνη, σάρξ and πνεῦμα (ψυχή), or formulas such as ἐν Χριστῷ are not Pauline but universally Christian, and do not even appear in their Pauline stamp. Others, like συνείδησις, ἐλευθερία, ἄφθαρτος, εὐπρόσδεκτος, or even ἀναστρέφεσθαι, νήφειν, καταρτίζειν, στηρίζειν are not at all specifically Christian, but are taken from the treasury of contemporary language. On the other hand there is no lack of striking points of contact with the Petrine discourses of the Acts, both in matter and form (Weiss, *Krit. Beibl. zur deutschen Zeitschr. für christl. Wissensch.*, etc., 1854, 10 f.; M. Kähler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1874, 3), nor of peculiarities of expression distinct from Paul's (οἶκος instead of ναός, ξύλον instead of σταυρός, φίλημα ἀγάπης instead of φίλ. ἅγιον, τὸ τέλος instead of τὸ λοιπόν, etc.).[3]

5. Even the situation presupposed in our Epistle puts no difficulty in the way of its genuineness. Peter must have left Jerusalem at an early date (Acts xii. 17) and according to Acts xv. he never appeared there again, but probably

[3] It is only on the *à priori* assumption that a primitive Apostle must necessarily speak the doctrinal language of the Gospels and the Apocalypse, and could only have learnt the saving significance of Jesus' death from Paul, that v. Soden has found the doctrine and doctrinal language of our Epistle irreconcilable with its having been written by Peter; whereas Mangold recognises the primitive-apostolic character of the teaching of the Epistle.

undertook missionary journeys to the Diaspora (§ 39, 3), so that he might readily have formed relations with the Jewish-Christian Churches of Asia Minor, although our Epistle does not properly speaking assume the existence of such relations before now. He was at this time on missionary travels in the countries about the Euphrates; for in v. 13 he sends greeting from the elect (Church) at Babylon.[1] With him is Mark, the son of a house to which according to Acts xii. 12 Peter at one time stood in the closest relation; hence it is not improbable that Mark was his spiritual son, *i.e.* was converted by him. Just as in Acts xiii. 5; xv. 39 he accompanied Barnabas on his missionary journey, so now he went with Peter to the East. The Epistle seems from v. 12 to have been brought by Silvanus, which however does not necessarily presuppose his presence in Babylon; since it may have been sent to him for further dispatch to Jerusalem. But since Silvanus only accompanied Paul on his missionary journey in Macedonia and Greece, and was certainly still with him in Corinth (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1), the Epistle cannot have been written until after Paul's return from that place (§ 15, 7), but not later than previous to the time when Peter could have received intelligence of the Galatian disturbances (§ 18, 1, 2) or of the results of Paul's ministry in Ephesus. Hence it certainly falls in the middle of the year 50.

6. The authorised doubts raised by criticism respecting this Epistle are entirely due to the current false conception of its

[1] The patristic misinterpretation of this passage with which Eusebius (*H. E.*, 2, 15) has made us familiar, as if it referred to Rome, has been revived not only by Hofmann and his disciples (comp. also Ewald and Sieffert), but has also been emphatically reasserted by the Tübingen school. It is of course entirely without foundation; since the typical and figurative language of the Apocalypse (§ 34, 3) cannot be regarded as a criterion of simple epistolary style and has nothing whatever to do with the designation of the readers as παρεπίδημοι in i. 1. Comp. on the other hand Keil and even Mangold.

address, and of its literary relation to the Pauline Epistles (No. 1, 2). That Peter should have turned to Pauline Churches for the purpose of confirming Paul's preaching by what would undoubtedly in this case have been intentional dependence on his Epistles, although our Epistle shows no trace of erroneous doctrine such as might have led them to doubt, is unquestionably an historical impossibility. Nor can it be supposed that they needed such confirmation on account of their suffering condition. Hence Claudius questioned with justice the genuineness of the Epistle (*Uransichten des Christenthums*, Altona, 1808); and it was only the weight of external testimony and the difficulty of conceiving a supposititious aim in the case of so simple a hortatory letter that hindered de Wette (comp. also Reuss) from carrying his strong suspicions against it to a definite rejection. Since Semler's time therefore recourse has been had to the unsatisfactory hypothesis that Mark, as Eichhorn maintained, or Silvanus the companion of Paul, as appeared more probable from v. 12 (comp. Ewald; W. Grimm, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1872, 4; Schenkel; Renan; and Weisse in his *Evangelienfrage*, 1856), wrote the Epistle more or less independently under Peter's direction.[1] The same false preconceptions likewise led to insoluble difficulties with respect to the

[1] It was of course quite unsatisfactory when Bertholdt, on the hypothesis put forward by Jerome (Ep. 150 *ad Hedib.*) though certainly erroneous, that Peter wrote in Aramean, asserted that it was translated by Silvanus (or Mark). If there had really been any difficulty in supposing that the former fisherman had acquired the capability of writing a Greek letter, on which Holtzmann again lays great stress, the expression in v. 12 would by no means exclude the presumption that Peter made use of him as a scribe. But the simple, unskilled Greek of the Epistle might well have been written by one who, living in Galilee among Greek-speaking people, certainly knew this language as well as his mother-tongue; and who, just because he was deficient in all Rabbinical culture, must have had recourse to the LXX. in order to read the original text of the Old Testament, if in his later position he desired to occupy himself with this (comp. § 37, 6).

determination of the Epistle's date. If with B. Brückner we suppose it to have been written immediately after the Pauline ministry in Asia Minor, it is impossible to conceive why Peter, instead of their own Apostle and without any mention of him, should have been moved to admonish the Churches there, apart from the fact that the Epistle bears no trace of the Galatian errors at that time still fresh in the memory, and makes no allusion to the questions to which these gave rise. If with Wieseler, Guericke, Bleek, Keil and others we go down to the Roman captivity of Paul, which is necessary if we are to assume that Peter knew and made use of the Roman and Ephesian Epistles, we cannot then account for the fact that we find no trace of the errors that had cropped up in Phrygia; and that Peter makes no allusion whatever to the imprisonment of their Apostle. The difficulties are only increased, if with most critics (comp. Sieffert and L. Schulze) we suppose the Epistle to have been written after the persecution of the Christians under Nero (No. 2, note 2).[2]

7. The Tübingen school was therefore justified, here if anywhere, in regarding this Epistle, in which Peter is said to bear witness to the orthodoxy of Paul (v. 12) and even to teach a modified Paulinism, in which Silvanus and Mark, both of whom belong to the primitive Church as well as to the Pauline circle, play a part (v. 12 f.), as the tendency

[2] If Paul perished in this persecution, it is inconceivable why Peter makes no mention of him, especially as this could be the only reason of his turning to these Churches; and it would be difficult to explain how Mark, whom Paul summons to Rome from Asia Minor (2 Tim. iv. 11), is found with Peter in Babylon. If however Peter be for this reason transferred to Rome (as by Wiesinger and Th. Schott), the silence respecting Paul's martyrdom, at the place where it occurred, is doubly incomprehensible. But if on the contrary we regard Paul as having been freed from captivity (comp. *e.g.* Hofmann, between 63 and 64), he had then himself returned to Asia Minor; and apart from the fact that our Epistle shows no trace of the doctrinal errors of the Pastorals, Peter had least of all a motive for encroaching on the Pauline missionary field.

work of a Pauline disciple whose object it was to unite the divided parties of the Church. But Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, 4), Pfleiderer, Holtzmann and Mangold have already dissented from this view of Baur's (comp. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, 2), Schwegler's and Hausrath's, because they rightly fail to see dogmatic tendencies of this nature in a writing whose aims are so purely practical, and attribute only a subordinate significance to the passage v. 12. On the other hand they have adhered all the more firmly to its having been composed in the time of Trajan, whose persecutions are said to form the proper occasion of the Epistle. The passage iv. 15 f. is supposed to be only a reminiscence of Pliny's question to Trajan, "nomen ipsum si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohærentia nomini puniantur" (*Epp.* 10, 97 f.);[1] the fact that the πάσχειν here spoken of cannot from the connection be judicial punishment but reproach for the name of Christ, that iii. 15 clearly from the tenor can have no reference to trial before a judge, and that the Epistle shows no trace whatever of organized persecution (comp. No. 2, note 2), being simply ignored. Schwegler indeed attempted to prove that hierarchical tendencies already appear in v. 1 ff. But the folly of finding the later technical designation of the clergy in the τῶν κληρῶν of v. 3, is now universally recognised; nor can it be questioned that the pursuit of gain and supremacy is natural to every superior position. On the other hand an Epistle in which the readers are still addressed as recent converts to Christianity (ii. 2, 25; iv. 3 f.), in which the charismata of the apostolic time are still operative (iv. 10) and where the hope of the immediate nearness of the end is so strong (No. 4. note 1), while all contact with Gnosis either sympathetic or other-

[1] Compare on the other hand v. Soden. Zeller alone tried to go back to the time of Hadrian; and Volkmar down to 140 on account of the alleged use in 1 Pet. iii. 19 of the Book of Enoch, which according to him originated in 132 (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1861, 4).

wise is lacking, is in the time of Trajan an historical impossibility no less than that from which this hypothesis was intended as a means of escape. For this reason v. Soden has recently gone back to the time of Domitian, disputing all ecclesiastico-political tendency; and thinks it very probable that Silvanus in the Apostle's name admonished the Churches in the universal persecution, which, however, cannot by any means be proved of Domitian's time (comp. also Sieffert, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1881). Moreover he has not succeeded in proving the need of an apostolic mask for so simple a letter of admonition and comfort.

§ 41. The Second Epistle of Peter.

1. That the general way in which the readers are characterized in the address (i. 1) does not forbid the assumption that the Epistle was intended for a definite circle of Churches, any more than the Epistles of James and Jude, hence that it is not addressed to all Christendom, as de Wette, Mayerhoff, Bleek, Schwegler and others maintained, is expressly shown by iii. 1, where the readers are spoken of as the same to whom the first Epistle of Peter is addressed. The Apostle now directly contrasts them with himself, a born Jew, as shown by the use of his full name Symeon (Simon) Peter, and his companions, characterizing them as having obtained like precious faith, viz. as Gentile-Christians.[1] And since the Churches of Asia Minor were essentially Jewish-Christian at the time when the first Epistle of Peter reached them (§ 40, 1), a period of about ten years must lie between the two Epistles, during which Pauline activity had essentially transformed the national character

[1] Spitta (*Der 2. Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*, Halle, 1885) probably stands alone in assuming that the readers like those of the the Epistle of Jude (§ 38, 3, note 2), were Jewish Christians, which he attempts to prove by a very forced interpretation of the address and of the introduction to the Epistle.

of Christianity in that country. The Churches are in fact spoken of in iii. 15 as having received Epistles from Paul; and according to iii. 2 other Apostles or apostolic-minded men besides Paul, must have worked among them; whereas at the time of the first Epistle (i. 12; v. 12) no Apostle had yet preached the Gospel in that circle.[2] Why he gives special prominence to the present essentially Gentile-Christian character of the Churches is manifestly due to the circumstance that the most suspicious manifestation of his time, the occasion of his writing, proceeded from Gentile-Christian circles and was operative in them. For there can be no question that it is the professed libertines of the Epistle of Jude (§ 38, 2) who are attacked in chap. ii. In the circles to which the author's attention is directed, or at the time in which he writes, these libertines had already gone the length of making a zealous propaganda on behalf of their principles; and had moreover already found the catchword by which to allure the Christians, professing to be the first to give true Christian freedom, however empty their great swelling words might be (ii. 17 ff.). They had also already begun to confirm this false freedom by a misinterpretation of Old Testament Scripture and Pauline letters (iii. 16 f.). For this reason the Apostle feared that worse might follow. These pernicious principles could not fail to be gradually

[2] That the reading in iii. 1 is τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν and not ἡμῶν, is established beyond a doubt by textual criticism. The fact that the author here forgets his part implies a want of thought such as even a pseudonymous writer would not be credited with, especially as Paul himself is able in 1 Cor. ix. 2 to distinguish between Apostles in general and those who bear this character for particular Churches. That they had received oral instruction from Peter, as Holtzmann maintains, and therefore that Peter had perhaps visited them in the meantime, as Keil for example assumes (*Komm.*, 1883), by no means necessarily follows from i. 16; although this would not in any case imply that he might have counted himself as one of their Apostles; for he proclaimed the power and the return of the exalted Christ in his first Epistle also, and the expression employed in this passage is sufficiently explained by assuming a reference to the common apostolic preaching which had reached even to them.

developed into a formal heresy, which by its seductive lustre and the zeal with which from interested motives it was disseminated, gained a large following and thus directly led to divisions in the Church (ii. 1 ff.).[3] But the great danger that lay in this manifestation was materially enhanced by the whole character of the time. We have already seen from the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse (§ 31, 3; 32, 2; 35, 1) how in the second half of the year 60 the apparent tardiness of the second coming, once so confidently looked for in the immediate present, led to a flagging of Christian hope which had formerly been one of the most powerful motives for striving after Christian virtue. We now directly hear how the retarding of the second coming began to give rise to complaints (iii. 9). And how would it be when all the first Christian generation which had so good a right to expect it (comp. Matt. xxiv. 34; Mark ix. 1) had passed away? The whole promise of the second coming could then not fail to be declared illusory; and while scoffing at the vanity of further waiting, men would give themselves up to their own lusts undisturbed by any thought of it (iii. 3 f.).[4]

[3] Here too the author has most unjustly been accused of inconsistency, in first predicting a manifestation as future, and afterwards describing it as already present. The distinction between present seducers who allure the simple with the catchword of true Christian freedom, and the sect-founding errorists of the future is made sufficiently clear. It is just as perverse to look for a background of Gnostic error where the former are concerned, as is done by the extreme defenders of the Epistle (comp. the *Komm.* of Dietlein, 1851, and Schott, 1883) in unison with its extreme opponents, as to connect them with the errorists of the Pastoral Epistles (comp. Guericke, Windischman) with whom they have nothing whatever to do. Moreover the following exposition will show that the view of a like contradiction in the manifestation spoken of in chap. iii. is quite untenable.

[4] The current notion that chap. iii. is directed against the same manifestation as chap. ii. (comp. Spitta), at least in its ultimate consequences, is entirely untenable, as even Keil perceives. The former treats of a purely future manifestation for predicting which the present alone offered a point of attachment; the latter of a present manifestation

It is only the current incorrect view of the first Epistle of Peter that makes the genuineness of the second *a priori* unacceptable. While this view necessarily puts the two Epistles close together in respect of time, it leaves the question as to how there is no trace in the first of the phenomena attacked and dreaded in the second, quite insoluble. But if, on the contrary, it could be proved that the fact of the second Epistle being chiefly directed to the danger threatening the life of [the Church within precluded an entering into the external oppressions of which the first says so much, however much these might come into consideration when the question of the delay of the second coming was concerned; the silence respecting it would be the more easily explained, supposing that the irritation of the world against the new religion so clearly accounted for in the first, had in the meantime diminished. The Pastoral Epistles that are so near to ours know nothing at least of direct oppressions of the Christians in Asia Minor.

2. There can be no question that in his description of the libertines in chap. ii. the author had the description of them in the Epistle of Jude before his mind. The whole section with its accumulated images and examples, with its excited polemic, consisting sometimes only of exclamations and losing every syntactical thread, is as foreign to the ordinary calm current of this Epistle as it is in keeping, both in substance and form, with the Epistle of Jude. The examples there adduced are widely expanded, prominence being given to entirely new aspects of them other than those which originally led to their being chosen (ii. 6–9, comp. Jude ver. 7; ii. 15 f., comp. Jude ver. 11); again the reference to the concrete example is abandoned and the general thought alone abstracted, the example being of course presupposed, the connection which called it forth and without which it is scarcely intelligible being no longer visible (ii. 4, comp. Jude ver. 6; ii. 11, comp. Jude ver. 9). A peculiar expression is sometimes retained, whose motive

from which worse consequences are only apprehended in the future. Though both undoubtedly threaten Gentile-Christian circles and the author evidently regards the former in its very relation to the latter as highly dangerous, yet they are quite distinct in their motives, and have moreover no connection.

is only explained by the context in Jude; or else the expression is woven out of reminiscences of the connection which with him is purely local.[1] In ii. 13 the shibboleth in Jude ver. 12 is adopted (*συνευωχούμενοι*) while the concrete allusion to the love-feasts is suffered to lapse, so that it is only the sound of the words that regulates the choice of the expression which is entirely different (*ἀπάταις* instead of *ἀγάπαις*, *σπίλοι* instead of *σπιλάδες*). But above all, dependence on the description in the Epistle of Jude is seen in this, that wherever the expression coincides with Jude it is unique in our Epistle, whereas when it is changed or added to, it immediately finds parallels in the independent parts of the second Epistle or in the first.[2] The impossibility of reversing the relation between the two Epistles actually appears from the fact that the different application of the figure in Jude 12 and the closer definition of the *ὑπέρογκα* in vers. 16 are conditioned by the way in which the libertines attacked in our Epistle appear directly as preachers of a false freedom (ii. 17 ff.). That this dependence on the Epistle of Jude is intentional and conscious cannot be doubted.[3]

[1] Compare the *κυριότητος* in ii. 10 with Jude ver. 8, the *ὀπίσω σαρκός* in Jude ver. 7, and the *τολμηταί* after the *ἐτόλμησεν* in Jude ver. 9; as also ii. 15 where in carrying out the example of Balaam we have a reminiscence of the *ὁδὸς τ. Καΐν* in Jude ver. 11; or ii. 17 where the figure is taken from Jude ver. 12, but the final clause from ver. 13. Thus another *tertium comp.* underlies a figure in Jude, and yet the expression which characterizes the comparison in the former is applied to the latter (comp. the *φυσικά* in ii. 12 with the *φυσικῶς* in Jude ver. 10); or the elements of one figure in Jude are applied to two independent similes which acquire an entirely new *tertium comp.* (ii. 17, comp. Jude ver. 12).

[2] Comp. Weiss, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, 2. Spitta has attempted to weaken the proof there given by adducing a number of words that do not affect the substance of it. According to him the expressions common to Peter and Jude, but occurring repeatedly in the former, only prove the dependence of Jude upon Peter; how little they prove this is shown by every estimate that goes beyond the mere collection of words made by Spitta (p. 459 ff.).

[3] Moreover he does not go beyond the description of the libertines; all

That the reference of Jude's Epistle to the second of Peter, accepted in tradition, cannot be thought of is clearly shown from the latter itself (§ 38, 2); is even conceded by the advocates of the genuineness of second Peter, as Guericke, Wiesinger and L. Schulze; and has not been refuted even by Spitta's recently attempted counterproof with its most violent exegesis and artificial criticism of the text. The whole question has been complicated from the beginning by being commonly made to turn on the point as to whether one of the two is a dependent copy of the other, betraying the imitator by its want of skill; or whether it may be directly designated as a plagiarism. Hofmann and Keil found it easy enough to prove that each one pursues his own course of thought in an independent and peculiar way. Nor are the utterances in our Epistle respecting the libertines suggested by that of Jude, but by an existing manifestation which, though agreeing with that attacked in the Epistle of Jude in its essential features, has peculiarities of its own (No. 1); to which, however, he freely applies the original description and polemic in so far as it suits his purpose.[4] The attempt to account for the omission of Jude ver. 14 ff. and the changing of Jude ver. 6, 9 by the wish of the pseudonymous writer to avoid Apocryphal traditions (although what he says in ii. 4 of the punishment of the angels is entirely taken from the Book of Enoch, while ii. 11 is only intelligible by that tradition of Moses); is based on the entirely false idea that the Epistle of Jude was made use of and worked over, whereas many of its other images (vers. 12 f.) and examples (vers. 6, 11) are not adopted. Only such an idea

---

other echoes such as appear in the ὑπομιμνήσκειν, σπουδάζειν i. 12, 15 (comp. Jude vers. 3, 5) or iii. 3 (comp. Jude ver. 18) are quite involuntary, although the concrete reference which the ἐμπαῖκται gains in connection with the Epistle of Peter, and which is quite unique, as also the κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι which has quite a secondary meaning, clearly show that iii. 3 is likewise based on a reminiscence of the Epistle of Jude.

[4] On the other hand it was quite a perversion to assert that although the pseudonymous writer of our Epistle might, on the basis of the Apostolic prophecy mentioned by Jude (ver. 18 f.), represent the phenomena of his time as condemned beforehand, he would yet be led by attachment to the Epistle of Jude to depict these phenomena as present. For, apart from the fact that the attachment to the Epistle of Jude is not so close as to make this possible, and that the opponents attacked appear as present even where there is no such attachment (ii. 19 ff.; iii. 16); the prophecy in ii. 1–3 relating to the further development of this libertinism has nothing whatever to do with the Apostolic prediction quoted in the Epistle of Jude; while iii. 3, the passage which really has an echo of it, does not refer to the libertines who are there foretold at all, but to doubters of the second coming.

could give rise to the strange dispute as to whether this use of the Epistle of Jude is worthy of an Apostle or not; on which account the genuineness of our Epistle was sometimes disputed, even by those who regarded the first as "dependent" at one and the same time on James and Paul, while others thought it necessary on behalf of its genuineness, to deny such dependence. In any case the literary relation of our Epistle to that of Jude has nothing whatever to do with the question of its genuineness, and does not prejudice it in any way.

3. After addressing good wishes to his Gentile-Christian readers (i. 1 f.), the Apostle shows them how by the knowledge of the promises given in their calling they had received everything that was necessary in order that the Divine power might work in them a new life of piety; and how it now depended only on their own zeal whether this knowledge would prove fruitful in a comprehensive life of Christian virtue, and whether, being kept from falling, they would likewise finally attain the end of their calling in the eternal kingdom of Christ (i. 3–11). To put them always in remembrance of these things would be his constant task during the short time he was still allowed to pass on earth; but he would (by this letter) take care that even after his decease they might have something to remind them constantly of these things (i. 12–15). This he is able to do, because he can appeal on behalf of the power of God and the return of Christ announced in the word of Apostles, to the fact that he was an eyewitness, inasmuch as he had seen the glory of Christ on the mount of transfiguration and had heard the Divine attestation of His Messiahship (i. 16 ff.); as also because the prophetic word of the Old Testament had thereby been made more sure to him and to his co-witnesses; a word which in accordance with its nature as resting entirely on Divine inspiration, does not receive its full interpretation from itself but from the day-dawn of fulfilment, whose prelude they had seen in the transfiguration of Christ (i. 19 ff.).[1] How urgent he regarded this task, ap-

[1] It is a noteworthy circumstance that in the context of Mark's

pears from the great dangers whose approach the Apostle, relying on the typical history of Israel, foresaw in the false teachers of the future (ii. 1–3). But in his view the judgment prepared for them, as also the deliverance of the pious, are already prefigured in Old Testament history (ii. 4–9); and at the same time the judgment of those who now destroy themselves by their unchaste and riotous life of sin, as formerly the case with the Israelites who were led astray by Balaam, whose folly verged on madness (ii. 10–16). The author here refers to the preachers of a new freedom who are themselves fallen under the worst bondage, drawing down on themselves the curse of apostasy to a former life of sin (ii. 17–22). Another reason why it is so necessary to put them in remembrance of these things is that before long there will come such as undermine the leading motive to a Christian life of holy effort, maintaining the hope of the hitherto unfulfilled promise to be altogether illusory, and giving up all expectation of a change in the present condition of the world (iii. 1–4). In opposition to them the

Gospel (ix. 2 ff.) just as here, the transfiguration on the mount appears as an attestation given to the three confidential friends of Jesus, of His first prophecy respecting the second coming. Whoever holds this narrative to be a myth or symbolic fiction certainly cannot affirm the genuineness of our Epistle, unless with Spitta he finds that the Gospels contain an already distorted account of the original transaction which is attested here only. But whoever explains i. 17 as a citation from the Gospel of Matthew or even that of the Hebrews, and thence infers the spuriousness of the Epistle (although the wording as we have it in the *Cod. Vatic.* does not in any respect coincide with these), simply takes for granted the thing that is to be proved; for *if* the Epistle be genuine, Peter gives form to the words which the disciples at that time thought they heard in the vision. Nor can those of course regard the Epistle as genuine who hold that John xxi. 18 f. is a late fiction; whereas Peter, if he were already advanced in years, might certainly conclude from the prediction of Christ, holding out to him the prospect of a violent death, that his end must now be near at hand, since he was not to exhaust the measure of human life to which he had so nearly attained (i. 14). That the author propounds in i. 20 f. a peculiar and later doctrine of inspiration (comp. Holtzmann), is an entirely groundless assumption.

Apostle shows how neither the permanence nor the security of the present state of the world, much less the apparent delay of the second coming, justifies such doubts (iii. 5–9); and that it rather depends on them to hasten the day of the Lord, which will undoubtedly come, though the time is not certain, and will with the destruction of the present world usher in the new world of promise (iii. 10–13).[2] In the conclusion terminating in a doxology the Apostle points out that Paul in his letters to them as well as in others, had given them the same exhortations to spotlessness of life, which, because they contained many things hard to be understood, had by those libertines been perverted like the Holy Scripture of the Old Testament. He then admonishes his readers to stand fast against these temptations, and to grow in grace and knowledge, in accordance with the wish expressed in his introductory greeting (iii. 14–18).[3]

[2] Offence has been taken without any reason at the author's alleged theories respecting the formation and destruction of the world; attempts even having been made to show that they had their origin in contemporary philosophies. But that the earth, which proceeded at the word of God from the waters of chaos and took form by the dividing of the water from the dry land (Gen. i. 2–9) after having continued for a long time perished nevertheless by the waters of the deluge, is entirely taken from early biblical history, as also that the present world, kept by God's power from perishing in the same way (Gen. ix. 11), can only be destroyed by the judicial fire of Divine wrath, of which the entire Old and New Testaments speak (iii. 6 f., 10, 12 f.). Nor is a renunciation of the hope of the second coming implied, because in face of the fact that the second coming was delayed longer than had been expected (comp. No. 1), it is urged that God does not measure according to human computation of time, and that He only manifests His long-suffering in giving us time for repentance (iii. 8 f.), that by our holy walk we may render it unnecessary, and even bring about a speedier coming of the day of the Lord (iii. 11 f.).

[3] According to this the reference to Paul is called forth entirely by the misinterpretation and misuse of his Epistles. The Apostle has probably in his mind the moral admonitions in the Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians addressed to Asia Minor; but adds that admonitions of this nature are to be found wherever Paul in his Epistles comes to speak of moral questions, because there are many things in other Epistles, for

4. An Epistle that finds the chief danger threatening endeavours after Christian virtue in the doubts already declared respecting the fulfilment of the promise, and knows no better way of protecting the Church from the temptation of a false doctrine of freedom menacing them in the present and the future than by the well-timed refutation of such doubts, unquestionably represents a view in which hope no longer forms the central point of the Christian life, as in the first Epistle (comp. § 40, 4, note 1). That knowledge forms this centre instead of hope can only be asserted if we overlook the fact that the knowledge of God and of Christ, of which i. 2 treats, is, as stated, not a theosophic speculation but the knowledge of our being called through the instrumentality of Christ to be partakers of the promises; which necessarily works a Godlike holiness in us (i. 13 f.) and is directly productive of a moral life (i. 8; ii. 20; iii. 17 f.).[1] Nor can it be disputed that the Epistle shows exactly

example that to the Romans, which were interpreted in the sense of carnal libertinism. To assume that we have here an allusion to all the Epistles now in the Canon and that their collection is implied, is entirely without foundation. Nor does the τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς imply that they were put on a par with the Old Testament writings in the sense in which they were afterwards combined with them in the Canon, especially as their significance is made to depend on the wisdom of the Apostles and not on their inspiration. Moreover we cannot understand how it can be asserted that the Pauline Epistles are here already regarded as the property of the whole Church, since a distinction is expressly made between those which were written to the readers, and others.

[1] That it is not the subjective ἐλπίζειν which is here referred to, but the substance of the ἐπαγγέλματα and the προσδοκᾶν for it, is shown by the circumstance that the former appears to be doubted even now, and still more in the future; whereas the latter is made necessary by the apparent postponement of the fulfilment, the explanation of which does not by any means imply a renunciation of the hope of the second coming (No. 3, note 2). The ἀποκάλυψις Χριστοῦ (1 Pet. i. 7, comp. v. 4) is in fact the παρουσία of our Epistle; and the eternal kingdom (i. 11) is the κληρονομία hoped for in 1 Pet. i. 4. It is just because the ἔσχατον τῶν χρόνων of 1 Pet. i. 20, has already come in with the first appearance of Christ, that, instead of employing the formula of Jude's Epistle (ver. 8), iii. 3 speaks of the last days of this consummation, which alone remain. The

the same Jewish-Christian character as the first one. If it has fewer allusions to Old Testament passages, taking the knowledge of them for granted (yet compare ii. 22; iii. 8, 13), this is easily explained if we remember that the first Epistle was addressed to Jewish-Christian Churches, whereas this one is addressed to Gentile-Christians. But the way in which promise and fulfilment are contrasted (i. 19 ff.), recalls 1 Pet. i. 10 ff.; the way in which Old Testament Scripture is put on a par with the oral and written word of the Apostles (iii. 2, 16) reminding us of i. 22–25; and the way in which the history of Israel is looked upon as typical of the history of the Church (ii. 1), of ii. 9 f.; iii. 6. Just as the section depending on the Epistle of Jude expands the narratives of Sodom and Gomorrah or of Balaam by independent borrowing from the Old Testament (ii. 6 ff., 15 ff.), so here we have the history of the deluge added on, reminding us most forcibly of 1 Pet. iii. 20 f., not only in the mention of Noah and the ἀσεβεῖς of his time (ii. 5) but especially in the way in which it appears as a type of the last judgment. Finally the reflections on the origin of the world, as also the conception and delineation of the great day of the Lord, are founded on the Old Testament (iii. 6 f., 10 ff.). Nor are allusions to the Lord's sayings by any means rare, for in these, as in ii. 5–7, the days of Noah and of Lot are put in juxtaposition (Luke xvii. 26, 28); the false prophets of the future (ii. 1 f.) and the thief in the night (iii. 10) having likewise been foretold by Christ (Matt. xxiv. 11, 43); while ii. 20 is taken from Matt. xii. 45. But the commandment of the Lord transmitted by the Apostles is expressly spoken of (iii. 2); and i. 16–18 recalls the way in

same long-suffering of God that formerly delayed the deluge (1 Pet. iii. 20) now delays the last judgment (iii. 9, 15); but that the present generation will live to see it is shown by iii. 11 ff. The idea of the σκήνωμα in i. 13 is quite in keeping with the figure of pilgrimage in 1 Pet. i. 1; ii. 11.

which the first Epistle is pervaded throughout by the remembrance of the historical life of the Lord. In the Christology we find hardly any advance till the doxology to Christ (iii. 18), for the τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν in i. 1 is scarcely genuine, however intelligible in itself.[2] The calling virtually implied in election (i. 19) rests just as in the first Epistle (ii. 9; v. 10; i. 15) on the Divine ἀρετή, guarantees the fulfilment of the promise, and is the motive for striving to be like God (i. 3 f.) through the mediation of θεία δύναμις (comp. 1 Pet. i. 5). Brotherly love here (i. 7) forms the climax of a holy walk (iii. 11, comp. 1 Pet. i. 15) just as it does there (i. 22); the ἐπιθυμίαι being its antithesis; even the polemic against false freedom in ii. 19 reminds us of 1 Pet. ii. 16; and the motives in ii. 2 of 1 Pet. ii. 12; iii. 16. From a biblical and theological point of view therefore, the second Epistle of Peter is allied to no New Testament writing more closely than to his first.

On the other hand it must be conceded that the expression of doctrine has much that is peculiar as compared with that of the first, favourite expressions of which are here wanting while others take their place; and that the same ideas are in many cases differently expressed. But Peter was hardly the man to coin a fixed didactic terminology like Paul or John, and in any case the two documents bearing his name are too limited in extent to afford evidence of it. There is much that reminds us of the doctrinal terminology of the Pastoral Epistles (such as the emphasizing of εὐσέβεια and ἐπίγνωσις, ἐντολή and ὑπομονή, σωτήρ as applied to Christ, μῦθοι, πλουσίως, ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι and such like), which are probably antecedent to our Epistle. The differentia still observed by Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 1) is doubtless founded on the impression made by chap. ii., where the language is influenced by the Epistle of Jude. The fact that the expression is periodic is easily

[2] That an Epistle so exclusively directed to the ethical estimate of eschatology, should contain no such express reference to the fundamental facts of salvation, viz. the death and resurrection of Christ as an Epistle whose aim according to 1 Pet. v. 12 is to confirm these facts by the mouth of an Apostle, follows as a matter of course; nevertheless the cleansing from sin and the ἀγοράζειν (i. 9; ii. 1) exactly correspond o the καθαρισμός and the λύτρωσις of the first Epistle (i. 2, 18).

explained if the space of ten years intervenes between the two Epistles, during which time Peter perhaps associated chiefly with Greeks and read Pauline letters. That he was still unpractised in writing, is shown by the irregularities in i. 17 and ii. 8, as also by the prevailing monotony of the Epistle, a characteristic by no means lacking in the first. It is only the assumption that our Epistles were written practically at the same time (comp. for example Hofmann) that has made it necessary to account for the difference of style in an artificial manner, or to explain it away. Over against the observations respecting the diversity in the lexical stock of words and use of particles, we have a long series of very striking resemblances.[3]

5. The presumption afforded by the second Epistle itself is therefore perfectly consistent with its having been written by the Apostle Peter. It is not the case that obscurity pervades the Epistle as to the circle of its readers or the author's relation to such circle, or that the description of the "errorists" fluctuates inconsistently between present and future,

[3] Compare the sparing use in both Epistles of the article, and the predilection for the indefinite τις, for ἐν, εἰς and διά, the frequent plurals of abstract nouns, participles put before the imperative, the predilection for the perfect participle particularly of the passive, circumlocutions with ἔχοντες, the putting of the negative expression before the positive with ἀλλά. Of words that agree, compare ἀναστροφή, ἀπόθεσις, διάνοια, ἰσχύς, κρίμα, κοινωνός, ἀρετή of God, γνῶσις in the sense of 1 Pet. iii. 7 (i. 5), τιμὴ καὶ δόξα, the plural ἀσέλγειαι, the ἴδιος, τίμιος frequent in both, the αὐτοί in ii. 19 (comp. 1 Pet. i. 15; ii. 5) and ὅστις in ii. 1 (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 11), προγινώσκειν, συμβαίνειν, κομίζεσθαι, δῆλον in the sense of 1 Pet. i. 11 (i. 14), ἀγαπᾶν as in 1 Pet. iii. 10 (ii. 15), τηρεῖν as in 1 Pet. i. 4 (iii. 17), πορεύεσθαι, ἀναστρέφεσθαι and αὐξάνειν with ἐν (comp. on the use of the ἐν, also i. 4; ii. 13 with 1 Pet. i. 14; iii. 16, 19; ii. 7 with 1 Pet. iii. 2; ii. 12 with 1 Pet. ii. 12; iii. 16), ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπί, παρὰ κυρίῳ, ἀεί, ὡς before the genitive absolute i. 3 (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 12), the εἰ in ii. 4, 20 (comp. 1 Pet. i. 17; ii. 3; iv. 17 f.), the ποῦ in iii. 4 (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 18). So too the ἐπόπται in i. 16 reminds us of ἐποπτεύειν (1 Pet. ii. 12; iii. 12), κῆρυξ in ii. 5 of κηρύσσειν (iii. 19), ἀστήρικτος and στηριγμός in ii. 14, iii. 17 of στηρίζειν (v. 10), ἐμπλέκειν in ii. 20 of ἐμπλοκή (iii. 3), ἐπιχορηγεῖν in i. 5 of χορηγεῖν (iv. 11), ἰσότιμος in i. 1 of πολύτιμος (i. 7), ματιότης in ii. 18 of μάταιος (i. 18), ὀλίγως in ii. 18 of ὀλίγον (i. 6; v. 10), κτίσις in iii. 4 of κτιστής (iv. 19), ἄθεσμος in ii. 7, iii. 17 of ἀθέμιτος (iv. 3), σπῖλοι κ. μῶμοι and ἄσπιλος κ. ἀμώμητος in ii. 13, iii. 14 of ἄσπιλος κ. ἄμωμος (i. 19), ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας in ii. 14 of πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (iv. 1). For further details see Weiss, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, 2.

between immoral seducers and doubters of the second coming (comp. No. 1). The dependence on the Epistle of Jude has nothing embarrassing whatever, so long as we do not apply an entirely false rule of literary usage to it (comp. No. 2). The Epistle is deficient neither in close unity, nor in transparency of aim and composition throughout (comp. No. 3); the complaints often heard as to poverty of thought, awkwardness and latitude, want of freshness and vivacity, are entirely subjective and prove nothing at all, since it cannot be shown that pseudonymous writings alone suffer from these defects. The doctrinal conception of the Epistle in so far as it appears in an Epistle of so limited and practical an aim, is closely allied to that of the first; while the diversity of doctrine, style and phraseology, where not counterbalanced by numerous resemblances, may be easily explained in the case of an apostle who was not much of a writer, from the difference of time between the two Epistles (comp. No. 4). The alleged use of later writings of the New Testament is entirely based on the preconception of its spuriousness, and therefore cannot prove it (comp. No. 3, note 1);[1] just as of course we can only speak of a strong desire on the part of the author to pass for the Apostle Peter, in case the spuriousness be established on other grounds. Traces of a later time are vainly looked for in the explanation of the apparent delay of the second coming (comp. No. 3, note 2), in the designation given to the mount of transfiguration in i. 18, or in the mention of the μῦθοι and αἱρέσεις (i. 16; ii. 1), which only be-

[1] The affinity with the Clementines brought forward by Credner and Schwegler is imaginary; even Holtzmann rightly declares the use of a *locus communis* such as ii. 19 (comp. *Recogn.*, 5, 12) to be entirely without significance. Reminiscences of Philonian writings or of Jewish-Alexandrian religious philosophy cannot according to No. 3, note 2 be thought of. The citation from a Jewish Apocryphon in 1 Clem. ad Cor. xxiii. 3 (comp. 2 Clem. xi. 2 ff.) has nothing to do with iii 4 and only shows that doubts such as our author foresaw did actually arise in the tenth decade.

come suspicious if interpreted in the sense of a later time. The reference to Paul and his Epistles in connection with the commandment of the Lord and Old Testament Scripture certainly admits of an entirely simple interpretation (comp. No. 3, note 3). The relation to the first Epistle only gives rise to difficulties if this also be put low down into the seventh decade (comp. No. 1, 4). On the contrary it is quite consistent with the fact that, in contradistinction from the former Epistle, the Apostle here feels himself near his end (i. 14); if the dependence on the Epistle of Jude written after the middle of the seventh decade (§ 38, 3) and his probable acquaintance with the Pastoral Epistles (No. 4), make it imperative to put the second far down in the second half of the seventh decade. That the Epistle was written after Paul's death does not indeed necessarily follow from iii. 15, especially as it contains no allusion to his martyrdom; but the way in which the Apostle in i. 12–15 feels himself solely responsible for the Churches of Asia Minor, is at least strongly in favour of the presumption that Paul had been removed from them for ever. On the other hand it is certainly no argument in favour of the Epistle having been written before the year 70, that the destruction of Jerusalem is not among the examples of punishment enumerated in chap. ii., while the present as well as the anticipated doubts owing to the postponement of the second coming are not put in connection with this event, although they were so confidently expected with it (Matt. xxiv. 29). Since therefore neither the martyrdom of Peter in the year 64, nor his death simultaneously with Paul, is at all credibly attested (§ 39, 5), space enough remains in the latter years of Nero for the composition of our Epistle; so that the only doubt still emphasized by B. Brückner falls away. The current view, that it was written in Rome (comp. Keil) does not find the smallest support in itself; and i. 14 is against rather than in favour of the assumption that Peter was already in a position

to expect his immediate execution, as Th. Schott still maintains.

6. The question of the genuineness of the Epistle assumes another form, if we inquire into its external testimony. Since the resemblances in Hermas, Justin and Irenæus (§ 6, 4; vii. 4; ix. 5) do not admit of proof, the fact is established that no certain trace of it can be found until far on in the 3rd century; and all that apologetics has hitherto adduced by way of illustration is entirely untenable. It first appears in Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in the very district where we have to look for its first readers, and is mentioned by Origen as being doubted, but probably only with respect to its claim to belong to the New Testament, since he himself used it without reservation (§ 10, 7). Assiduous use was already made of it in the time of Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 3); but he himself naturally could only reckon it with the Antilegomena (§ 11, 4).[1] The Church did not suffer herself to be misled by this in her recognition of the Epistle; nevertheless the fact remains that the 3rd century is the first that has any knowledge of a second Epistle of Peter. Erasmus and Calvin revived former doubts respecting it, the latter being inclined to attribute it to a disciple of Peter, who wrote in his name with his authority. Grotius ascribed it to Bishop Symeon of Jerusalem, regarding as interpolation everything that told against this view. So long as the Lutheran Church still admitted distinctions within the traditional Canon, she classed our Epistle

[1] The remark of Didymus respecting its spuriousness also refers only to this; and the frivolous criticism of Kosmas Indicopleustes with whose views of cosmogony 2 Pet. iii. 12 did not harmonize, has no weight whatever (§ 11, 6). It was Jerome who first said in his exaggerated way that it "a plerisque ejus negatur" on account of the difference of style (*De Vir. Ill.*, 1), which he tries to explain on the assumption of different interpreters (*Ep.* 120 *ad Hedib.* 11); but this criticism was probably an hypothesis to account for its late and divided reception into the Canon, more than the reason of it.

with the apocryphal or deutero-canonical writings; with special reference to it Chemnitz declared the Church to be unable "ex falsis scriptis facere vera, ex dubiis et incertis certa, canonica, et legitima." Semler in his paraphrasis (1784) declared that an Epistle which appeared so late in the Church could only have been written towards the end of the 2nd century. On the other hand the Eichhorn-de Wette criticism, by which even Guericke (in his *Beitr.*) was for a time imposed upon, adhered to the composition of the Epistle by an apostolic disciple; and since Neander in 1832 definitely declared in favour of this view, it has continued to be the prevailing one down to the present time, even in the circles of very conservative critics (comp. for example Lechler). But the internal arguments put forward by these critics are untenable (No. 5); and when we place the composition of the Epistle in the first century, as Ewald did, and come down at latest to the first half of the 2nd with Credner and Bleek, the latter of whom also committed the blunder of supposing the author to have been an Alexandrian Gentile Christian, the main doubt, arising from its late appearance in the Church, is not practically diminished. On this ac-account Mayerhoff already ascribed it to an Alexandrian Jewish Christian in the middle of the 2nd century; while Reuss regarded it as one of the later pieces of pseudo-epigraphic literature, declaring its reception into the Canon to be the only example of a decided error on the part of the Church. Schwegler and Volkmar were the first to come down once more with Semler to the end of the 2nd century; but the latest criticism, which interprets it, with Grotius, as an attack on the Carpocratians like the Epistle of Jude, seems inclined to adhere to the middle of the century (compare Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, Mangold, Holtzmann).

The Epistle has certainly never been at a loss for defenders. Nitzsche wrote against Grotius (*Ep. Petr. Post.*, Lips., 1785, comp. also Flatt, *Genuina Sec. Ep. P. Origo*, Tüb., 1806, and Dahl, *De Auth. Ep. P. Post*

et Jud., Rost., 1807); Michaelis and Hug adhered to its genuineness; Bertholdt, like Jerome, resorted to the theory of an interpreter and rejected chap. ii. as an interpolation (comp. also Lange); Schott represents it as having been composed after the Apostle's death by a disciple, in accordance with his design; while Ullmann (*Der 2 Brief Petr.*, Hdlbrg., 1821) only tried to defend the first chapter as a Petrine fragment (comp. also Bunsen). Against him Olshausen took up the pen (*De Authent. et Integr. P. Epist.*, Region., 1822, 23), only however arriving at a subjective conviction of the authenticity; against Mayerhoff Windischmann (comp. Heydenreich, *Ein Wort zur Vertheidigung*, etc., Herborn, 1837). Guericke, Thiersch, Stier (*Komm.*, 1850) and Dietlein (*Komm.*, 1851) afterwards defended the Epistle, the last of whom was so fortunate as to discover a mass of testimony to the Epistle in the apostolic Fathers. Among later critics no definite decision has been ventured upon by Wiesinger, B. Brückner and Grau, who are rather in favour of the genuineness, or by Huther (*Komm.*, 1877) and Sieffert, who rather incline to the spuriousness; on the other hand, Th. Schott, Hofmann and Kiel, L. Schulze and Spitta are disturbed by no doubts. Comp. also Weiss, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, 2.

7. In the event of its being impossible to explain the silence of the second century respecting the second Epistle of Peter from circumstances with which we are unacquainted and perhaps cannot unravel, the Epistle cannot have arisen earlier than towards the end of the 2nd century, when the written memorials of the apostolic time first began to be used as normative authorities.[1] On this assumption a pseudonymous writer then put words of exhortation to the Churches of his time into the mouth of the Apostle, ostensibly addressed to them by him shortly before his death. In this

[1] The passage iii. 2 certainly appears to regard the prophetic writings and the commandment of the Lord handed down by the Apostles (not yet in the Gospels) as the normative Canon; and this would point to the first half of the 2nd century, before a Canon of the Gospels was yet formed (§ 5). But the preliminary conditions for the production of pseudonymous apostolic writings were at this time and even later still wanting, since the latter were by no means specific authorities in the Church (§ 7, 7); moreover it would then be incomprehensible how a writing which must have been intended to find acceptance with the Church, could have remained unknown and even unmentioned for almost the space of a century.

case the fact that mention was made in Jude ver. 17 f. of apostolic predictions, which seemed to point to the libertines of his time (for the description substantially taken from Jude must at least have suited them), may certainly have had something to do with the form in which he wrote; inasmuch as he was thereby convinced that he was attacking them in the spirit of his Apostle, even if he extended the prediction to wicked scoffers at the Christian hope of the future.[2] If once we find reason to regard the work in the light of a pseudonymous piece of writing, we are certainly struck by the intentional way in which it is characterized as having been written by the Apostle for his Churches shortly before his end and left to them as a testament (i. 14 f.), and by an appeal to him as one of the disciples of the mount of transfiguration is set forth in all its importance (i. 16 ff.). Moreover the way in which the author adheres in iii. 1 f. to the first Epistle of Peter and is only intent on repeating the admonition there given by the Apostle to be mindful of the prophetic word and the commandment of the Lord, now appears in a new light; how earnestly he endeavours to write in the spirit and sense of the first Epistle of Peter, not without success, we have already seen; as also how much of its ex-

[2] But it is time to put an end to the idea that the pseudonymous writer may be recognised by the fact that he moves in senseless contradictions (for example, lest he should betray himself he dates the Epistle to Christendom as a whole, and yet in iii. 1 assumes that he is writing to the readers of the first Epistle of Peter, as he is accused of doing), forgets his part, confounds present and future; all which things it is impossible to impute to so thoughtful a composition, and moreover what never happens in the case of a pseudonymous writing. The predictions of chaps. ii. and iii. being put into the mouth of the Apostle, naturally form a prophetic intimation on his part (ii. 9 ff.) of the libertines of the 2nd century, such as in our author's view he had in mind; the scoffers foretold in iii. 3 then being the τινές who account for their doubts by the alleged delay of the second coming (ver. 9). Above all it cannot be supposed that in using the Epistle of Jude, he wished to avoid what was apocryphal, for a strict separation between the canonical and apocryphal at the close of the 2nd century cannot be proved.

pression he adopts. So too the mention of Paul's Epistles in iii. 15 f., apart from the fact that he wishes to denounce their misinterpretation in the sense of libertinism, must then be designed to show that the doctrine he has put forward is not merely Petrine but Petro-Pauline, viz. in the opinion of his time, universally apostolic.[3] Then too we may take the τὰς λοιπὰς γράφας in the natural though not necessary sense, that the apostolic writings are placed side by side with those of the Old Testament as the authorities from which each one must seek to prove that his view is justified; a thing which certainly could only happen at the end of the second century.

A thoughtful criticism ought not however to shut its eyes to the great difficulties that stand in the way of this apparently so transparent view. The libertines attacked in chap. ii. do not present the features of the dualistic gnosis of the second century any more than the libertines of Jude's Epistle, however much we may look for them; on the contrary, the way in which they are represented in iii. 16 as taking their stand on the Old Testament and on the writings of Paul, is altogether opposed to the idea that they are meant. It is moreover striking that the author does not put the prophecy of Jude ver. 17 f. at the head of the section in which his chief opponents are attacked, although his whole composition hangs by it; as also that he adheres so closely to the writing of one who was not an apostle, although anxious that his own words should pass for those of an apostle. Consequently, unless we abandon the unity of the composition, we must assume (however improbable it may be) that the scoffers of chap. iii. were the very same libertines who mocked at the threat of the judgment expected at the second coming of Christ, because this second coming that had so long been delayed was no more to be

[3] Even then there can be no idea of a conciliatory aim, as Schwegler emphatically asserts and most critics admit to some extent. For "to bring about the final and lasting conclusion of peace between Petrines and Paulines" would require more doctrinal detail than our Epistle presents and not the mere assurance that Paul was at one with Peter in Christian ethics (and for the most part in eschatology), a point that was never in dispute between the parties of the apostolic period. And it only enhances the difficulty of understanding the pseudonymous composition if on account of this passage we ascribe to it an aim that manifestly does not explain the greater part of its contents. But even on this assumption there can be no thought of a "collection" of Pauline writings belonging to the whole Church (comp. No. 3, note 3).

looked for. But it is just in this that the main difficulty of the view lies. For it is quite incomprehensible how a delay of the second coming could still be talked of (iii. 9) at the end of the 2nd century, when it must long have been admitted that the second coming had not taken place at the time when it was first expected; or how the doubts respecting it should be explained in a way that so visibly points to the dying out of the first Christian generation (iii. 4). Moreover chap. i. certainly seems to imply that the main object of the whole composition is to combat these doubts (as Mayerhoff, Credner and others maintain), a view which again destroys the unity of the Epistle, because, as already seen by de Wette, chap. ii. has then no connection with chap. i. Finally it cannot fail to be seen that if we once assume the pseudonymous character of the writing and its composition in the 2nd century, iii. 16 points just as certainly to the fact that the Canon was in a state of formation at the end of the first century, as does iii. 2 to the first half of it (comp. note 1), whereby the whole explanation of the writing becomes in this aspect very insecure. Hence the possibility that the work is on the whole what it claims to be, and that circumstances unknown to us alone prevented its recognition before the 3rd century, need not be excluded, nor the question of its genuineness be declared definitely settled.

§ 42. The First Epistle of John.

1. Since Heidegger it has often been doubted whether this writing is intended for an epistle proper.[1] It certainly does not begin with the epistolary address and invocation of blessing, such as we have hitherto invariably found except in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and yet, as already perceived by Lücke (*Komm.*, 1836), the introduction has unmistakably the character of an epistle. The author does not give his name, but he describes himself as an eye-witness of the life of Jesus and a preacher of the gospel; he does not name his readers, but characterizes them as those to whom he preached; he expresses no wish for their happiness, but states that he writes in order to perfect his joy

[1] Reuss would only go the length of calling it a pastoral writing (comp. also Holtzmann, *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1881, 4; 1882, 1–3). This question is usually connected with the other one, as to the relation of the Epistle to the Gospel of the same author; but since that is just as much matter of dispute, it must first be answered itself on the basis of our Epistle.

in that which this preaching had hitherto effected in them (i. 1–4). Nor does he conclude with a benediction, but with an impressive final exhortation outside the limits of the usual stereotyped formula (v. 21). In no case is the work a treatise; the questions discussed by the author, in which he defends his views against doubts and attacks, are neither theoretical nor practical; they are meditations on the great fundamental truths respecting which he is at one with his readers, and which he elucidates now on this side and now on that, spinning them out in contemplative fashion and demonstrating their consequences as regards life. These meditations however are not the object proper, they repeatedly pass into direct admonition; nor is it an ideal public to which he addresses them. It is made evident again and again, as well as in i. 3 f. that it is a definite circle for which and to which he writes (ii. 1, 7 f., 12 ff., 21, 26; v. 13). It is the circle familiar to him, in which he works and in which therefore he occasionally includes himself (ii. 19), a circle which had long ago received the gospel (ii. 7), in which he pictures to himself persons of different ages (ii. 12 ff.), which he sees threatened with errors (ii. 26; iii. 7), and of which he is able to speak words of praise (ii. 20 f.; iv. 4). In any case it is mere disputing about terms to say that a work of this kind is not an epistle in the sense of New Testament epistolary literature; for which reason Lücke, de Wette, Bleek, Düsterdieck (*Komm.*, 1852, 54) and Huther (*Komm.*, 1880) have rightly adhered to the view that it is an epistle.

2. Herein lies the right to make enquiry respecting those circumstances of the Church which gave rise to the Epistle. The author himself represents it as characteristic of his time that liars appeared who denied that Jesus is the Christ; and he attaches such significance to this phenomenon that he regards it as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Antichrist (ii. 18, 22). But that this is not meant in the sense of the

Jewish denial of the Messiahship of Jesus, already appears from the fact that he identifies the denial of the Father and the Son, viz. of the perfect revelation of God in Christ, with it (ii. 22 f.); and expressly says that it is a denial of the confession of Jesus as the Christ who appeared in the flesh (iv. 2). In the same way the antithesis in v. 6 that these errorists denied the full incarnation of the eternal Son of God and hence the identity of the man Jesus with the heavenly Christ expressed in the author's view by the name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, implies that they could at any rate admit that he came ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, but not at all that he came ἐν τῷ αἵματι. But this is nothing else than the teaching of Cerinthus according to which the heavenly æon Christ united at baptism with the man Jesus, but separated from him again before his death, which therefore does not at all amount to an actual incarnation and therewith to the perfect revelation of God in the historical life of Jesus (comp. Iren., *adv. Hær.*, I. 26, 1; Epiph., *Hær.*, 28, 1).

Setting aside as utterly untenable the views of older expositors according to which the errorists were now Jews and now representatives of some Oriental wisdom, as also that of Bleek who adhered to the opinion that they were in general Christians who had suffered shipwreck of their faith, they were sometimes regarded as Ebionites, as by Eichhorn, sometimes as docetists, as by Lücke, de Wette, Credner, Reuss, Hausrath and Schenkel; or it was supposed that two kinds of errors were combated, as by Sander (*Komm.*, 1851) and Lange. But the idea that Jesus had merely the appearance of a body is only an artificial inference from the antitheses of the Epistle; and it is this which constitutes the peculiarity of Cerinthian Gnosis, viz. that in it the denial of the essential Divinity of Jesus is combined with the theory of a heavenly æon Christ, who was not really man. For this reason Schleiermacher, Neander and the later critics Düsterdieck, Ebrard (*Komm.*, 1859), Huther, Haupt (*Komm.*, 1869), Braune (*Komm.*, 1869), as also Keim, rightly adhere to the view that the Epistle refers to Cerinthus. The objections to this opinion, raised by Guericke, Thiersch, Ewald, Mangold, Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann may be summed up in the position that the Jewish-Christian teaching of Cerinthus could not have been associated with Antinomianism. But no trace of Antinomianism on the part

of these errorists is anywhere to be found (comp. Huther and B. Brückner, *Komm.*, 1863). Nor is there the slightest reason for thinking of the Basilidians (Pfleiderer, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1869, 4 and Holtzmann).

To assume that the appearance of these errors was the proper occasion of the Epistle, as Holtzmann still emphatically asserts, is at variance with its professed aim.[1] The fundamental idea of the Epistle is, that the joy of the writer in his readers can only be complete, if the fellowship with God and Christ to which his preaching has led them, be proved in a Christian and moral life. Hence it follows that the Epistle cannot be directed against Antinomian libertinism, even if such be looked for among these errorists or by the side of them. Against this, it would not have been necessary to argue that sin was *ἀνομία* (iii. 4), but on the contrary that *ἀνομία* is sin.[2] The error against which the

[1] Nowhere do we find these controverted; on the contrary in direct opposition to them the readers are admitted to be in possession of a knowledge of the truth (ii. 20 f.), and in want of no teaching (ii. 26 f.). The errorists have already separated from the Church and that openly, for the Church by holding fast to the truth has compelled them to withdraw (iv. 4; v. 4 f.). They are now only in that world which is completely separated from the Church; to it they belong and in it they find sympathy (iv. 3 ff.); which naturally does not exclude the necessity for the Church to be on its guard against their seductions and by careful examination to distinguish the spirit which actuates them from the Spirit of God (ii. 26 f., iv. 1, 6).

[2] Nevertheless there is something striking in this characteristic word. If intentionally chosen, it can only mean that with every sin there is a falling back into the *ἀνομία* abhorred by all. In this case we can at most assume that Antinomian libertinism had formerly prevailed in the circle of the readers, and is now looked back upon as a thing that has been overcome. It is not improbable that the *νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν* in ii. 13 also has a retrospective allusion to the overcoming of this Antinomianism, just as the *ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* has to the exclusion of Gnostic Ebionism; and as the *νικᾶν τὸν κόσμον* in v. 4. is supposed to have a double meaning. But it by no means follows that the Gnostics were the Antinomians. Comp. to the contrary § 35, 1; 38, 2; 41, 1; 47, 7. The *πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν* in v. 17 does not belong here at all, since it merely introduces the distinction between mortal sins and sins that are venial. On the other hand the final admonition in v. 21 is

author contends is not that sin is allowable under certain circumstances : but he denies that good works, which exclude all that is sin, may be neglected under any pretext. The μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς in iii. 7 shows unmistakably that it is not a purely theoretical meditation in which he disputes this view. There were those who thought they could be δίκαιοι without requiring the ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ; these however were no errorists but Paulines who in the righteousness given by grace forgot that Paul enforces with equal earnestness the carrying out of righteousness in works. In the very beginning we find a warning against the error of supposing that they were free from sin and no longer needed to turn away with earnestness from all that was sinful (i. 8–ii. 1) ; and in the very passage where the author shows how the endeavour to fulfil the Divine commands, requiring constant growth (iii. 18 ff.), is quite consistent with full assurance of salvation (παῤῥησία πρὸς τὸν θεόν, iii. 21 ff., comp. iv. 17), we find the thought that these commands are included in those of faith and love (iii. 23). The whole discussion of the Epistle amounts to this, that of these two things faith, even viewed in its origin, is the first ; for which reason assurance of salvation is ultimately traced back in a certain sense to faith (v. 13 f.). In the very circles possessed by the full consciousness of having overcome fatal error by means of faith and of having fundamentally rejected all carnal libertinism (comp. note 2), repose in the consciousness of being justified by faith and the assurance of salvation founded on such consciousness might beget a certain quietism paralyzing the energy of Christian endeavours after holiness.[3] The hatred

probably intended to have a double application, referring to the idols of false gnosis *and* of libertinism.

[3] On the other hand it would be quite a mistake to infer from these discussions on the part of the author that the Churches were in a critical state, as Lücke does ; or that they were in a condition of moral depravity (comp. Erdmann, *Prim. Joannis epist. argum.*, Berlin, 1855) ; or

of the world which can neither understand (iii. 1) nor love Christianity, is mentioned in so incidental a way (iii. 12 f.), that there cannot have been any special danger threatening the Churches from without.

3. After the epistolary introduction (i. 1–4) the author enters upon the fact of the revelation of God fulfilled in Christ, showing how a walk in the light thereof must be manifested by the constant acknowledgment of sin (i. 5–10) and a true knowledge of God be attested by the fulfilment of the Divine commands (ii. 1–6). Remarking that this requirement though as old as the gospel which they had heard, was yet a new one, viz. that it arose out of their present situation, he characterizes this situation as one in which the light had already become a victorious power in the world, and had found a place in the Church (ii. 7 f.); from which he proceeds to the inference that its members must love one another as brethren (ii. 9 ff.). But since the Church is sharply separated from the world not less by possessing the forgiveness of sins (ii. 12 ff.) than by the true knowledge of Christ and the fact of having overcome Satan (comp. No. 2, note 2), the reverse side of the love which binds their members together is separation from all love of the world (ii. 15 ff.). Finally the immediate situation in which they are placed is specially marked by the circumstance that the appearance of antichristian error points to the conclusion

with Guericke and others to conclude from the fact that special stress is laid upon love (a fact entirely conditioned by the author's peculiar mode of view) and from incidental exhortations on this subject (iii. 18; iv. 7) that their love had waxed particularly cold; for nowhere do we find any special expression of censure either as regards events that had taken place in the Church or with respect to the condition of it. It would be just as erroneous to conclude from the details which make the necessary connection of Christian knowledge and Christian life (iv. 6 f.) culminate in the fact that a knowledge which does not lead to the keeping of the Divine commands is untrue, that Gnosis in its more limited sense, and moreover an Antinomian gnosis, is attacked (comp. in particular Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann).

that it is the last time (ii. 18–22). The first inference to be drawn therefrom is the duty of abiding on this account in the truth and thus in God, in order not to be put to shame at the directly impending second coming (ii. 23–28); and secondly the necessity in face of the approaching completeness of their relation as children to purify themselves from all that is not in keeping with this hope (ii. 29–iii. 6). These three reflections on the nature of their Christian state and the inferences to be drawn therefrom, manifestly form a kind of introduction, for it is the warning in iii. 7 that first brings into view a concrete motive for the subsequent discussions. After the fundamental note has been sounded in ii. 29, it is next shown how the practice of righteousness is the specific mark of sonship to God as contrasted with sonship to the devil (iii. 7–10), but in particular the exercise of brotherly love, which is as characteristic of the children of God who have obtained eternal life, as is the hatred of the world (iii. 10–18). The attestation of our Christian state, and therefore the foundation of our assurance of salvation, lies only in observance of the Divine commands, commands which are comprised in the union of faith and love (iii. 19–23).[1] In this way the author first comes to his proper

[1] This section gives us a clear glance into the practical aim of these discussions. It cannot be overlooked that the idea of faith here appears in the Epistle for the first time, and is moreover classed in the first place with the ἐντολαί on the fulfilment of which our confidence of salvation is based. Nor can it be misapprehended that we have here an antithesis to the view which regards confidence of salvation as having its foundation in faith as such, in distinction from works. This is exactly the Pauline view, with whose character and significance our author was still unacquainted; and it is manifest that he only contends against false conceptions and applications of it. In opposition to the obvious objection that our keeping of the Divine commands must always be imperfect, the very one on which the Pauline thesis was based, he declares in advance that He who knoweth the heart, knows that we are ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας even when our hearts condemn us, always presupposing that this is attested by active love (iii. 19 f. Comp. also the way in which in i. 8 f.; ii. 1 the consciousness of sin which always adheres to the Christian

leading theme; for the object is to show that in these *two* things lies the proof of our fellowship with God and hence of our salvation state; and although faith is emphasized throughout as being the first of these, yet chief stress is always laid on the requirement of the second. If fellowship with God culminates in His abiding in us, the fact may be recognised chiefly by His Spirit being in us (iii. 24). But since this Spirit is distinguished from the spirit of error by the confession of Christ, therefore to hear (and believe) it, is a sign of the presence of God (or His Spirit) in us (iv. 1–6); and because love can only result from a knowledge of God, which, impossible in itself, arises only when the Spirit by sending the Son teaches us to know the love of God and therewith the essence of love in general; therefore we know by our own love that God or His Spirit is in us (iv. 17–13). By returning in iv. 13 to iii. 24 it is clear that the author concludes the first circle of ideas; hence the *second* now begins at iv. 14. For it is likewise on the fact that the Apostles were themselves eye-witnesses of the sending of the Son, that faith in the love of God manifested in Him rests, and with it the certainty that whoever confesses Him in faith has perfect fellowship with God (iv. 14 ff.). And this certainty directly leads to the dwelling of love in us, inasmuch as God's proper essence is love and is now made perfect in us as in Christ, which thing of itself gives a confidence in looking forward to the judgment, which shuts out all fear (iv. 16 ff.). It is indeed love toward God that is the firstfruits of His revelation of love, and love to the brethren is necessarily bound up with it (iv. 19 ff.). The

is silenced by pointing to the forgiveness of sins that is always ready for us and to the intercession of Christ). It is clear that the author has here reached the culminating point of his discussion, from the fact that whereas reference is hitherto made only to abiding in God, at most to the abiding of His word (ii. 17, 24), His anointing (ii. 27), His seed (iii. 9) in us, we now hear continually of the abiding in us of God Himself.

same course of thought recurs a *third* time; but with express reference to the power of faith to overcome the world, which faith can only result from being born of God, viz. from the self-witness of God dwelling and working in us (comp. ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7), and has for its direct consequence the love of God, out of which proceeds spontaneously the love of the brethren and the fulfilment of all the Divine commands (v. 1–4).[2] The author has thus shown that the emphasizing of love together with faith, does not rob the latter of its just due and significance, but rather reveals them fully for the first time, and so prepares the way for his declaration that the faith which overcomes the world can be no other than faith in the Divine sonship of Jesus, in a sense resting on the witness of God at the baptism and the death of Jesus which coincides with the testimony of the Spirit in the Apostles (v. 6–9), as also on the evidence of individual experience of the eternal life directly possessed in faith (v. 10 ff.). This is immediately followed by the *conclusion of the Epistle* in which the author reminds his readers how in faith they have an actual assurance that God will hear their prayers, an assurance only limited in the case of the sin unto death (v. 13–17); in the consciousness of being born of God a protection against all the temptations of the devil (v. 18 f.); and in fellowship with Christ a knowledge of the true God and of eternal life (v. 20); whereupon the author concludes with a warning against idols (v. 21, comp. No. 2, note 2).

[2] Hence it is clearly shown that these two things, in which the guarantee of our state of salvation lies, are not co-ordinate one with another, but that on the contrary faith not only occupies the chief place in relation to love, but is its efficient cause. As according to iv. 7–13 love not only proceeds from a knowledge of God such as can be attained by faith in the sending of Christ alone; and since according to iv. 19 abiding in love presupposes a knowledge of His act of love towards us revealed only to faith; so faith born of God, which overcomes temptation to error, develops spontaneously into love for the Creator and the fellow-creature.

Formerly there was much contention respecting the arrangement of the Epistle of John (comp. Luthardt, *De pr. Joh. epist. comp.*, Leips., 1860; Stockmeyer, *Die Structur des ersten Johannesbriefes*, Basel, 1873). It was first of all attempted, after Bengel's example, to make it fit into the Trinitarian scheme; Lücke contented himself with dividing it into 8–10 groups of ideas; Ebrard (*Komm.*, 1859), Hofmann (in his *Schriftbeweis*), and Luthardt reduced this number to 5; while Huther finally came down to 4. On the other hand de Wette, Ewald, Erdmann and others adhered to a threefold division, Hilgenfeld, Düsterdieck and Haupt dividing it only into 2 parts; all however differing in many respects as to the points of division, and not even all perceiving that the conclusion of the Epistle begins with v. 13. Holtzmann, following Flacius and Reuss, still doubts all logical division, and certainly such can neither be proved by tracing the threads of a premeditated arrangement nor be expressed by theoretical headings of the various parts (comp. for example Düsterdieck, *Gott ist Licht, Gott ist gerecht*). The work is an epistle not a treatise, the discussion has not the form of dialectic development but of thoughtful meditation on certain great fundamental truths; of these however the progress is quite transparent, if only the proper occasion of the Epistle be rightly understood. It is true the same thoughts frequently recur; but they are always placed in a new light by their connection, and are looked at from new points of view. The unity of the Epistle consists in its object, viz. in opposition to self-satisfaction in the certainty of salvation, to admonish his readers to the observance and attestation of it in a Christian and moral life, especially in love.

4. We have seen from the beginning how a knowledge of the Epistle of John goes hand in hand with that of the Gospel in the case of Barnabas and Hermas, though not so much with Ignatius; its use is in Polycarp and Papias earlier attested than that of the former (§ 5, 7); even in Justin we find echoes of it (§ 7, 3). At the end of the 2nd century it forms a part of the New Testament, and is repeatedly quoted by Irenæus, Clement, and Tertullian as Johannine (§ 9, 5); it is received into the Syrian Church-bible as John's Epistle, is closely associated with the Gospel in the Muratorian Canon (§ 10, 1, 2), and from the time of Origen and Eusebius is reckoned a Homologumenon. The author does not give his name, but classes himself with those who were eye-witnesses of the earthly life of Jesus (i. 1 f.); that he was so, is shown by the Epistle with its

vivid recollection of the example (i. 6; iii. 3, 5, 7; iv. 17) and word of Jesus (i. 5; iii. 23; iv. 21),[1] as also of the events that took place at His baptism and crucifixion (v. 6 ff.). He is undoubtedly a Jewish Christian, as is shown by his conception of the Χριστός and ἀντίχριστος, of the χρῖσμα and ἱλασμός, of the cleansing from sin and of the sin unto death, but above all by his entire fundamental view as distinguished from that of Paul. In his eyes the doing of God's will, the keeping of His commands and the practice of righteousness are throughout the aim and guarantee of a state of salvation; that sin is ἀνομία (iii. 4) seals its condemnation. The Word, as with James and Peter, is the seed of the new life in which there is no more sin (iii. 9; comp. ii. 14). All thought of the Old Testament law is thus excluded; the sum of the Divine commands is faith in the name of the Son and love to the brethren which proceeds from love to God (iii. 23; v. 2).[2] But the chief peculiarity of the Epistle is the mystical character of its fundamental view. Eternal life is manifested in Christ (i. 2), and is directly given to the believer in Him (v. 11

[1] Express reference to isolated sayings of earliest tradition, such as occur in James and Peter, the Epistle does not contain, much less points of contact with the Gospels which Holtzmann professes to have found. The fact that he, like James (iv. 2), puts hatred on a par with murder (iii. 15), is in keeping with the spirit of his master, without any necessity for supposing that he thought of Matt. v. 21 f.; and his promise with regard to the hearing of prayer (iii. 22) required no reference to Matt. xxi. 22; while v. 3 has no connection whatever with Matt. xi. 30. It is moreover a strange fancy that the expression ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (ii. 12) must be borrowed from the synoptic Gospels on account of the Doric form of the perfect passive.

[2] Actual Old Testament citations are not found, because the Epistle is addressed to Gentile-Christian readers. The fact that an author who has such manifest regard for Paulinism, as he understood it and believed it to be misunderstood, should have shown acquaintance with Pauline Epistles would not in itself appear strange; but there is no shadow of proof for what Holtzmann adduces in favour of this, or of his acquaintance with other New Testament writings.

ff., 21); the being and abiding in Christ and through Him in God is nothing but the promised eternal life (ii. 24 f.), into which the Christian already passes on this side of death (iii. 14 f.), and in which he has fellowship with the Father and the Son (i. 3, 6). Rarely however is there any mention of mediation through Christ, as in v. 20; the highest thing, to which the glance is always directed, is rest in God who is fully revealed in Him (i. 5) and intuitively apprehended (ii. 4, 14) in His deepest essence, which consists in love (iv. 8) and therefore draws us into this new life of love (iv. 16). The dwelling and abiding of God in us corresponds to our dwelling and abiding in Him (iii. 24; iv. 16), He gives us His spirit (iii. 24; iv. 13), Himself working in us a new life; we are born of Him (iv. 7; v. 1), and may now be called His children; being of like nature with Him (iii. 1, 10), we cannot do otherwise than love as He loves, the Father as well as the brethren (iv. 19; v. 1). For those who are born of God, the commandment is no longer necessary; they cannot sin, the devil does not touch them (iii. 9; v. 18). Nevertheless, the mysticism that so frequently strays into quietism or even Antinomianism, is in this case the declared antithesis of both. The author knows how often the Christian is not what he ought to be; his whole Epistle has no other aim than to show that without practical attestation of a knowledge of God, of fellowship with Him and sonship to Him, all is self-deception and a lie. It is a misapprehension of this mysticism to suppose that it is not in keeping with the description of the son of thunder pourtrayed in the Gospels (§ 33, 1). It is just because John found in his ardent devotion to Christ the highest good, viz. God Himself and fellowship with Him, that everything is in his view separated into these blunt antitheses that know no medium, children of God and children of the devil; the brethren and the world, light and darkness, truth and

falsehood, love and hatred, life and death. In the manifestation he always sees the essence, in the beginning the end, in the development the principle; but for this very reason he recognises only being and not being, all else is self-deception or conscious falsehood. It is certain that he can only by a slow process have arrived at this purified mysticism in which all contrasts of knowing and doing, ideal and realization, of this life and the next, of man and God are solved, a solution that could only have been found by him who had from the beginning been next to the heart of Jesus, because he gave Him his whole heart.

5. That the Epistle and the Gospel proceed from the same author is obvious. They are connected together not only by numerous striking parallels of thought and expression, but by the whole world of conceptions they have in common, by the peculiarity of feature that characterizes their entire theological view, as also by the same development of thought and mode of expression.[1] Both works are

[1] In both everything proceeds from the γινώσκειν τὸν θεὸν (τὸν ἀληθινόν) or ὁρᾶν τὸν θεόν to the εἶναι and μένειν ἐν θεῷ (τῷ υἱῷ, comp. the dwelling and abiding of God and Christ or His word in one), γεννᾶσθαι and εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (as opposed to ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου). Christ is the λόγος, the μονογενής and παράκλητος, the Son of God come in the flesh, faith a πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, the Spirit τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. Comp. the contrasts of φῶς and σκοτία (with περιπατεῖν ἐν), ἀλήθεια (ποιεῖν ἀλήθ., ἐκ τ. ἀληθ. εἶναι, ἀληθ. ἐν ὑμ.) and ψεῦδος (ψεύστης), of ἀδελφοί (τεκνία, παιδία, τέκνα τ. θ.) and κόσμος (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἶναι, νικᾶν τ. κόσμ.); the ἐντολὴ καινή, the τηρεῖν (διδόναι) τὰς ἐντολάς (τ. λόγον); αἴρειν, ἔχειν and ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, πιστεύειν and γινώσκειν, ὁμολογεῖν and ἀρνεῖσθαι, μαρτυρία and μαρτυρεῖν, θεᾶσθαι and θεωρεῖν, χρείαν ἔχειν ἵνα, ἁγνίζειν ἑαυτόν, ἐκεῖνος of Christ, ἀνθρωποκτόνος. Note the same predilection for an unperiodic mode of expression and for irregularities, for antithetic (οὐκ-ἀλλά) and progressive parallelism, for carrying on the thought by taking up again the preceding idea, for the heaping up and the recurrence of the same expressions, the demonstrative with ὅτι and ἵνα, the elliptical ἀλλ' ἵνα, the καθώς-καί and οὐ καθώς, etc. Direct parallels with the Gospel are i. 1 f., comp. Gosp. i. 1; i. 4, comp. Gosp. xvi. 24; ii. 8, comp. Gosp. i. 5; ii. 11, comp. Gosp. xii. 35; ii. 27, comp. Gosp. xiv. 26; iii. 1, comp. Gosp. i. 10; iii. 8, comp. Gosp. viii. 44; iii. 11, 16

nevertheless entirely independent. In many cases the Epistle has been taken for the second (practical or polemic) part of the Gospel (comp. Michaelis, Eichhorn, Storr *über den Zweck der evang. Gesch. u. Briefe Joh.*, Tüb, 1786, 1810; Bretschneider, in his *Probab.*, 1820) or directly as an accompanying and dedicatory work (comp. Hug, Frommann, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 4; Thiersch, Hofmann, Ebrard, Hausrath, and likewise Haupt). But as a matter of fact no trace of a reference to the Gospel can be found, since it lies neither in the introduction (i. 1 ff.), nor in the ἔγραψα (ii. 14, 21); and the Epistle by no means requires the Gospel as a commentary, such being supplied to the readers by the whole teaching of the author. The Tübingen school first started the question as to whether both writings proceed from the same author, or whether on the contrary it is not more probable that one was intentionally connected with the other, their similarity resting on literary dependence; although these critics have never agreed as to which was the original writing.

It is singular that Baur should have declared the Epistle to be the copy on account of its poverty of thought, its fluctuating and tautological character and its want of logical power (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1848, 3; 1857, 3), whereas Hilgenfeld (*Das Evang. u. die Briefe Joh.*, Halle, 1849; *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1859, 4; 1870, 3) maintained that it was the earlier owing to its wealth of originality and its fresh, lively and attractive character, neither of them insisting on difference of authorship. Yet the question still remained whether the two works did not represent different stages of development of the same author. While Bleek, B. Brückner, and Huther adhered to the priority of the Epistle, as did Pfleiderer and Zeller (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1845, 4; 1847, 1) on the assumption

comp. Gosp. xv. 12 f.; iii. 12, comp. Gosp. vii. 7; iii. 13, comp. Gosp. xv. 18 f.; iii. 14, comp. Gosp. v. 26; iv. 6, comp. Gosp. viii. 47; iv. 9, comp. Gosp. iii. 16 f.; iv. 12, comp. Gosp. i. 18; iv. 14, comp. Gosp. iii. 17; v. 3, comp. Gosp. xiv. 15, 21; v. 6, 8, comp. Gosp. xix. 34 f.; v. 9, comp. Gosp. viii 17 f., v. 32, 34, 36; v. 10, comp. Gosp. iii. 33; v. 12, comp. Gosp. iii. 15, 36; v. 13, comp. Gosp. xx. 31; v. 18, comp. Gosp. xiv. 30; v. 20, comp. Gosp. xvii. 3.

of different authors, Lücke, de Wette, Reuss, Guericke, Mangold, and Schenkel persisted in the opinion that the Gospel was written first; the Muratorian Canon likewise assuming a reference to it on the part of the Epistle. Finally Holtzmann, following Hoekstra in this respect, has interpreted the Epistle as a remoulding of the theology of the Gospel in the interest of the popular conception of Christianity, thus necessitating a difference of authorship; for in his view it was the aim of the author to introduce the Gospel also into wider circles.[2]

Notwithstanding all resemblances and borrowing, the theological standpoint of both must be regarded as different. On this point indeed opinion has from the first been regulated by the false assumption that the discourses of Christ contained in the Gospel were solely an exposition of the theology of the author; whereas, if historical recollections lie at their basis, it is just as conceivable that they should contain many ideas and trains of thought that have not been fully assimilated by the author in his peculiar method of teaching, as on the contrary that, however great an influence his mode of teaching and expression may have had on his rendering of the discourses, many peculiar forms of doctrine specially characteristic of him should not have been put into the discourses of Jesus consciously.[3] On the other hand the

[2] He thinks he has found a number of proofs of this, even in verbal expression; but apart from the fact that instead of ἀπό the Gospel has in some cases παρά, which is wanting in the Epistle (at least according to the *Sin.* and *Vat.*), he has not been able to bring forward anything of the least weight when compared with the points of agreement to which we drew attention in note 1; for the expressions he enumerates, each of which occurs once or twice in one of the two, prove nothing where the difference in the writings itself explains them, as it frequently does. His attempt to show the intentional dependence of the Epistle on the Gospel throughout, is very forced.

[3] Comp. Roos, *Theol. Stud. aus Würtemb.*, 1881. If this can be shown in the Gospel itself, where the doctrine of the Logos in the stricter sense and the being born of God, which occupy so significant a place in the prologue, have not passed over into the discourses at all, the more deeply stamped doctrine of the Epistle regarding the saving significance of the death of Christ, the doctrine of the σπέρμα and χρῖσμα, of the ἐσχάτη ὥρα and the Antichrist, or technical expressions of Apostolic doc-

alleged differences between Gospel and Epistle have only been created by misinterpreting the former in a spiritualistic and Antinomian sense.[4] It is only by forcing the religious mysticism of the Epistle into dogmatic formulas entirely foreign to it, that a semblance of theological discrepancies with the Gospel may perhaps be made out. Moreover it can hardly be supposed that there was any considerable difference of time between the Epistle and the Gospel which represented a further development on the part of the author, as even B. Brückner was willing to

trinal language, such as *παρουσία*, *παῤῥησία*, *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον*, *ἀνομία* naturally belong to it. On the other hand the *κοινωνία* of the Epistle is only the expression for the *ἐν εἶναι* of the Gospel, and the term *παράκλητος* used of Jesus is only an application of the utterance respecting the *ἄλλος παράκλητος* (Gosp. xiv. 16). So too the peculiar mysticism of the writer of the Epistle is naturally in many cases put into the discourses of Jesus; but whereas the Epistle is mainly directed to the climax of these discourses, viz. our dwelling and abiding in God and His in us, God's love to us and ours to Him; in the Gospel their confirmation by personal community of life and love with Christ, is naturally made prominent, to which the Epistle also points. Since the Gospel only shows this highest aim prefigured in Christ, it lays chief stress on discipleship with its duties and blessings and on the mediating efficacy of Jesus, which was a foregone conclusion with the believers to whom the Epistle is addressed and therefore needed no emphasizing. We have thus disposed of everything from which Holtzmann in particular endeavours to prove differences between the two writings, except in so far as they rest merely on false exegesis. Of other non-assimilated ideas in the discourses of Christ comp. the *γεννᾶσθαι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, the *προσκυνεῖν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*, *αἰτεῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*, *ἐλευθεροῦν*, *εἰρήνην ἔχειν*, *ἀποθνήσκειν ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* and suchlike, in particular the rich symbolism of Christ's discourses, of which only *φῶς* and *σκοτία* are actually adopted.

[4] It is not correct that the Gospel has transformed the hope of the second coming (comp. xiv. 5) into the return of Christ in the Spirit, thus abandoning the ground of primitive Christian eschatology on which the Epistle unquestionably takes its stand; the Gospel speaks of the resurrection and the judgment at the last day (vi. 39 f.; xii. 48), so that even Holtzmann can count the *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς* and *κρίσεως* (v. 29) as its peculiar property. Neither is the Gospel Antinomian, even if like the Epistle it has for the disciples only a *τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς* comprised in the commandment of love.

admit. Nevertheless the prologue to the Gospel, with its self-sinking into the pre-existence of the personal Logos and into His participation in the creation of the world as in all revelation, with its definitely expressed conception of the incarnation and the resting of the Only-begotten in the bosom of the Father, must always be regarded as the ripest fruit of the author's contemplation, of which we should certainly find further traces in the Epistle if it had been written after the Gospel. And it is hardly conceivable that the author after having once carried out the idea of the Spirit as the Paraclete to so complete a personification as he does in the farewell discourses of the Gospel, an idea moreover based on an undoubtedly genuine saying of Christ (Matt. x. 19 f.), should have gone back in the Epistle to the earlier notion of the χρῖσμα. In the Epistle, moreover, the devil is not called ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου. So far the Gospel must stand as the last word of the author.

6. However fully the substance and form of the Epistle show that it was a work of the Evangelist, there is no doubt that it cannot, as criticism has maintained since Dionysius of Alexandria, have proceeded from the Apocalyptist (§ 33, 3). It is obvious indeed that a writing whose exclusive aim it is to paint visions of the future and to strengthen in patience and hope a Church that was threatened in times of trouble with persecution by the secular power, presents few points of comparison with a writing of fatherly admonition to Churches which, scarcely yet threatened even from within, only needed encouragement to persevere in the right way and to attest their state of faith and salvation by works.[1] The

[1] Nor do the Epistles of the Apocalypse form any analogy (chaps. ii. and iii.), since according to the situation assumed they are dictated by Christ Himself, and utter praise and blame, exhortation and warning respecting entirely concrete relations, in accordance with a stereotyped plan, and therefore cannot contain personal outpourings of the author's heart. Add to this, that the Apocalyptist was always to some extent bound to a given form, or intentionally adhered to definite types;

world represented in the Apocalypse as overtaken by the judgment of an angry God, is the heathen world with its sinful abominations and false prophecy, which persecutes Christianity and mocks at all exhortations to repent; unbelieving Judaism, the synagogue of Satan, being only incidentally included; but even in the Epistle, notwithstanding God's universal purpose of salvation, the world stands apart from the children of God and is at enmity with them (iii. 1, 13). False prophecy and all *ἀνομία* are thrust out by the latter and, like all sins unto death for which intercession is no longer of any avail, falls under the judgment, a judgment known also to the Epistle (iv. 17; v. 16 f.); whereas the Church even in the Apocalypse is the seat of Divine love and fellowship (iii. 9, 20). Hence any comparison which puts the God of the Epistle who is love (but comp. also Gosp. iii. 36) over against the angry God of the Apocalypse, is a false one, ignoring the situation and aim of the two writings. The lofty christological predicates of the Apocalypse only reach their comprehensive expression in the God-like Son of the Epistle, here as there His blood is the cleansing propitiation (i. 7; ii. 2); here as there the faith which confesses Christ and does not deny Him, is the condition of salvation along with the *τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολὰς* (*τὸν λόγον*), as shown in *ἔργα*. The fact that special emphasis is there laid on the *ὑπομονή* lies in the historical situation and corresponds to the *μένειν* here required throughout; the watchword of *νικᾶν*

whereas the writer of the Epistle is quite untrammelled in his meditations. Even if what has been said of the Rabbinical learning of the Apocalypse be imaginary, and a supposed artificial character only ascribed to it by a false interpretation (comp. § 34, 4), yet in the case of so fanciful a creation, the opportunity for artificiality of form is already supplied, just as it is entirely wanting where a writing of pastoral admonition is in question. The fact that the Apocalyptist gives his name, whereas the author of the Epistle (as of the Gospel) only describes himself as an eye-witness, rests on this alone, that it is only the person of the seer who guarantees the truth of his prophecy.

is common to both though its meaning is naturally modified here owing to the situation. In both the second coming is expected, which is to bring with it the completion of sonship to God (iii. 2; comp. Apoc. xxi. 7). No actual difference of doctrine can be absolutely proved.[2] The Apocalyptist still lives entirely in the Old Testament world of ideas and images, to which moreover he is bound by its typology, now virtually abandoned except for a few reminiscences. Instead of it we have a religious mysticism developed entirely from the contemplation of the Divine revelation perfected in Christ and scarcely needing support in the religious consciousness of the Old Testament any longer (comp. No. 4). That the necessary psychological conditions for the development of this mysticism did not exist in the Apostle John from the beginning, cannot be shown from the Apocalypse, which is exclusively directed to the warfare of Christian life from without and has no motive for entering into the development of the inner religious life. The explanation of John's being so far emancipated from his Jewish-Christian past however is simple enough, if the Epistle was not written until some decades after the Apocalypse. At that time he had but recently changed his Palestinian home for Greek soil, Jewish-Christian for Gentile-Christian surroundings, primitive apostolic for Pauline circles; now he has long been quite at home in them. For at the beginning of this

[2] It cannot for instance be found in the circumstance that in the Apocalypse it is the last Roman emperor who is Antichrist, whereas the Epistle regards Antichrist as having come in the false prophets of Cerinthian gnosis. Only by a complete misapprehension of the essence of New Testament apocalyptic can it be supposed to contain fixed doctrinal opinions which exclude one another, instead of an interpretation of the signs of the times necessarily varying according to the change of position. A false idea of inspiration must necessarily take offence at this; but it is not at variance with the biblical view of prophecy. Even Paul at the time of the Thessalonian Epistles saw the false Messiah emerge from apostate Judaism, and at the time of the Epistle to the Romans hoped for the restoration of Israel (comp. § 17, 7, note 3).

period the great judgment of God, which by the destruction of the Temple detached the Christian Church from the soil of national life and worship in which it was planted and had grown up, was impending over Jerusalem. In this way it became possible to take root in foreign soil of an entirely different character. That these decades must also have made a change in his language, may be assumed as a matter of course.[3] Exclusive intercourse with Greek-speaking people must have familiarized him with the language of his new home, and have smoothed away the asperities which the Apocalypse still shows (§ 34, 7). The style, however, remains unperiodic, the construction the simplest possible, the phraseology Hebraistic, and the expression as a whole monotonous; it is only in the Gospel that the particles begin to be more numerous, and attraction to be more abundantly used, while the genit. absolute, acc. with inf. and suchlike already appear. The stock of words must be very different, for the Apocalypse has to do with rich-coloured imagery, and the Epistle with an analysis of the innermost religious life, or with bare narrative, like the Gospel. Nevertheless striking points of agreement are not wanting.

Traces, reminding us of the irregularities of the Apocalypse, are seen in the *πλήρης*, Gosp. i. 14, the quite structureless *κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ* xv. 5 (comp. 2 John 2), the unnatural apposition *τὴν ζωὴν τ. αἰώνιον* 1 John ii. 25, the wrong use of the constr. ad syn. Gosp. xii. 12 (*ὁ ὄχλος — ἀκούσαντες*, comp. xxi. 12; *οὐδεὶς — εἰδότες*), xvii. 2 (*πᾶν* taken up again in *αὐτοῖς* and *ἐκεῖνοι*, as in xv. 6 *τίς* in *αὐτό*), 1 John v. 16 (*δώσει αὐτῷ — τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν*), 2 John 1 (*οὓς* after *τέκνα*) and strong examples of the var. struct. as in Gosp. ii. 24 f.; iii. 28; xiii. 29 (comp. also iv. 11; 3 John 10), finally the period Gosp. vi. 22 ff. which is at all events somewhat confused. The *γίνεσθαι* or *εἶναι εἴς τι*, Apoc. viii. 4; Gosp. xvi. 20;

[3] The assumption that John in the year 70 was too old for this, is entirely arbitrary, since the younger of the sons of Zebedee may very well have been only a youth in the beginning of the thirties. It was singular enough that Eichhorn and Ewald should have supposed they found traces of the weakness of old age in the Gospel.

1 John v. 8 are Hebraistic: the διδόναι ἐκ, Apoc. iii. 9; Gosp. vi. 11; 1 John iv. 13 (comp. the λαλεῖν ἐκ, Gosp. iii. 31; 1 John iv. 5) corresponds to the ἐκ instead of the simple genitive or τινες with the genitive used with like frequency in the Apocalypse and Gospel (comp. 2 John 4); the extensive misuse of ἵνα is common to the three writings (comp. in particular Gosp. xii. 23; xiii. 1; xvi. 32 with Apoc. ii. 21; also Apoc. xiii. 13 with Gosp. xv. 13; 1 John i. 9; iii. 1 and the elliptical ἵνα Apoc. xiv. 13; Gosp. i. 8; ix. 3; xii. 18; 1 John ii. 19). Compare also ἵνα with indicative in Gospel and Apocalypse.[4] A predilection for taking the nom. absol. up again with αὐτός is common to all the Johannine writings, while in the Gospel (i. 27; xiii. 26), as in the Apocalypse, αὐτός very often follows the relative and in the Apocalypse the participle, which in the Gospel (comp. 2 John 9) is ordinarily resumed with ἐκεῖνος and οὗτός. Even the demonstrative before ὅτι so common in the Gospel and Epistle is already found in Apoc. ii. 6. Comp. also the καί, Apoc. xix. 3; Gosp. xvii. 25, and with the solution of relatives and participial clauses, Gosp. iv. 12; i. 32; v. 44. In comparison with these how little importance can we attach to differences of language which Holtzmann still adduces in his Introduction.

---

[4] For the usage of words compare in the Apocalypse and Gospel, besides numerous quite insignificant words, ἡ ἄμπελος, ἄνεμος μέγας, ἀρνίον, δαιμόνιον (not δαίμων), δηνάριον, δόξα (δ. τ. θεοῦ, δόξαν διδόναι), ἐξουσία (c. inf., ἐξ. ἔχειν), ἡ ἔρημος, ἡ ἡμέρα (ἐκείνη), θερισμός, θλῖψις (θλ. ἔχειν), θρίξ (τρίχες), θύρα (metaph.), κάλαμος, καταβολὴ κόσμου, κλέπτης (figuratively), κοιλία, κόπος, κρίμα, κύριε in address, λαμπάς, λύχνος, μάννα, μέρος (ἔχειν), μέτρον, μῦρον, νυμφή and νύμφιος, ὁδός c. gen., ὄφις, ὄψις, πηγὴ (ὕδατος) and ποταμοὶ (ὕδατ. ζ.), πῆχυς, πλοῖον, ποτήριον, πρόβατα, σατανᾶς, σημεῖον, σῖτος, σκεῦος, σπηλαῖον, στάδιος, στέφανος, ὕδατα, υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ., φοῖνιξ, φρέαρ, φυλακή, διὰ τὸν φόβον, φωνή (μεγάλη φ., ἀκούειν τῆς φ.), χιλίαρχος, χόρτος, ψεῦδος, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα (ἐκείνη ἡ ὥρ.), ἄπιστος, βαθύς, γυμνός, δικαία κρίσις, δεῦρο (δεῦτε), ἐντεῦθεν and ἐκεῖθεν, ἑβραϊστί, ἐγγύς (of time), θαυμαστός, ἴσος, ἐν λευκοῖς, λίθινος, μέσον, μέλας, ναί, ὅσος and τοσοῦτος, πορφυροῦς, πτωχός, ταχύ, ἔμπροσθεν, ὀπίσω, ἐπάνω, ὑποκάτω, ἁγιάζειν, ἀγοράζειν, αἴρειν λίθον, ἀναβαίνειν (to heaven), ἀνοίγειν, ἀπέρχεσθαι πρός, ἁρπάζειν, βάπτειν, βαστάζειν, γεμίζειν τι ἐκ τιν., δέειν (δεδεμένος), διψᾶν, δοξάζειν (τ. ὄνομα), ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω, ἐκκεντεῖν, ἐκπορεύεσθαι, ἐκχέειν, ἐλέγχειν, ἐπιτιθέναι, εἴρηκα, ἐθευνᾶν, ὁ ἐρχόμενος (ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε), ἑτοιμάζειν, εὐχαριστεῖν, θαυμάζειν διά, θεραπεύειν, θερίζειν, ἱστάναι (ἕστηκα, ἑστώς, ἔστην), ἰσχύειν, καθῆσθαι and καθίζειν, καίεσθαι, καταβαίνειν ἐκ τ. οὐρ, καταφαγεῖν, κατηγορεῖν, κλαίειν, κοπιᾶν, κράζειν, κρατεῖν, κρύπτειν ἀπό, κυκλοῦν, λαλεῖν μετά (λέγων), λαμβάνειν ἐκ, λούειν, μεθυσθῆναι, μέλλειν, μνησθῆναι, μνημονεύειν, ξηραίνειν, ὁδηγεῖν, παίειν, παρεῖναι, πεινᾶν, πειράζειν, πέμπειν, περιβάλλειν, πιάζειν, πίνειν, πίπτειν (πρὸς τ. πόδας), πνέειν, ποιμαίνειν, προσκυνεῖν, προφητεύειν, πωλεῖν, σημαίνειν, σκηνοῦν, συμβολεύειν, συνάγειν, συν-

7. Following the example of predecessors like Jos. Scaliger, Cludius and others, whose opinion is quite without weight, Bretschneider in his *Probabilia* (1820) was the first to refuse the authorship of the Gospel, as also of our Epistle, to John, and to attribute them, as Dr. Paulus has likewise done (*Komm.*, 1820), to the presbyter John, more especially on account of the doctrine of the Logos and the attack on docetism. As a matter of fact, however, the Gospel only attacks the gnosis of Cerinthus, with whom according to a tradition that goes back to Polycarp, John was contemporary (§ 33, 2). But since he is said to have lived till the time of Trajan (§ 33, 4), and since the author's emancipation from Judaism as well as the difference of language between Gospel and Apocalypse is best explained by putting him as late as possible, he cannot have written before 90 A.D.[1] As de Wette adhered to the genuineness of the Epistle, so Weisse (in his *Evangel. Gesch.*, 1838) attempted by means of it to separate the genuine from the spurious in the Gospel. The Tübingen school, whose conception of the Judaistically limited standpoint of the primitive Apostles certainly falls with the genuineness of the younger Johannine writings, first

τρίβειν, σύρειν, σφάττειν, σφραγίζειν, τελεῖν, τηρεῖν ἐκ, τίκτειν, τρέχειν, φαγεῖν ἐκ, φέρειν (οἴσειν), φεύγειν (φεύξεσθαι) ἀπὸ, φιλεῖν; φοβεῖσθαι (μὴ φοβεῖσθε), φωνεῖν, φωτίζειν, χορτάζεσθαι. The Apocalypse shares with the Epistle εἴδωλα, σκάνδαλον, ψευδοπροφήτης, ἰσχυρός, ψεύδεσθαι, ποιεῖν τ. δικαιοσύνην; in all Johannine writings compare διάβολος, διδαχή, ἐντολαί, κρίσις, μαρτυρία and μαρτυρεῖν, μισθός, ὄνομα (διὰ τ. ὄν.), σπέρμα, χρείαν ἔχειν, ὥρα, ἀληθινός, ἄρτι, ἔσχατος (of time), ὅλος, ὅμοιος with dative, πᾶς (never ἅπας) with a following articled participle and a following negative, ὅταν, ἵνα μή, ἐνώπιον, αἴρειν, ἀποστέλλειν, ἀρνεῖσθαι, οἶδα ποῦ (πόθεν), εἰσ- and ἐξέρχεσθαι, ἥκειν, θεωρεῖν, θαυμάζειν, κεῖσθαι, κλείειν, λύειν, μένειν, μισεῖν, νικᾶν, ὁμολογεῖν, ὄψεσθαι, περιπατεῖν, πλανᾶν, πληροῦν (πεπληρωμένος), τηρεῖν (τ. ἐντ., τ. λόγ.), ὑπάγειν, φαίνειν, φανεροῦν, χαίρειν.

[1] A nearer determination cannot be arrived at: that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem (comp. Ziegler and Fritzsche), or even that ii. 18 contains a reference to this event, as Grotius, Michaelis, Hänlein and even Düsterdieck maintained, is inconceivable.

relegated these more or less far down into the 2nd century (comp. on the other hand Grimm, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849, 1); and in connection with the repudiation of the Gospel it was followed by the later critical school, to which Mangold also belongs. But the theory that it contains echoes of Montanism, advocated by Baur after the example of Planck (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1847, 4), has already been refuted by Hilgenfeld; while Hilgenfeld's idea that traces of Gnostic dualism are found in it, to which likewise Holtzmann assents, rests on a misinterpretation of the Epistle with its purely ethical distinction between children of God and children of the Devil, as also does the alleged attack on a dualistic gnosis (No. 2). Of the relations which gave rise to the Epistle we have no definite knowledge. Hug sought to prove that it was written in Patmos, on the assumption that the author was without ink and paper, an inference drawn from an incredible interpretation of 2 John 12; 3 John 13. Others, such as Ebrard and Haupt, take their stand on the very uncertain tradition that the Gospel was written in Patmos; although this is connected with the erroneous supposition that he was banished to the island (§ 33, 5). It must have been written in Ephesus where John had his abode, and therefore cannot have been addressed to Ephesus (comp. Hug), but to the Churches of Asia Minor in whose midst John laboured; for it certainly is not a Catholic Epistle in the most comprehensive sense, as Hilgenfeld and others maintain (No. 1). The view that it was designed for Christendom outside Asia Minor, of late so emphatically put forward by Holtzmann, is based on a false interpretation of the καὶ ὑμῖν and καὶ ὑμεῖς (i. 3). The earlier view, current from the time of Grotius to that of Guericke, that it was addressed to Jewish-Christians of Parthia, owes its origin to the superscription *ad Parthos* prevailing in the West from the time of Augustine (*Quæst. Evang.*, 2, 39), which, though not yet fully explained, is quite untenable; for antiquity

knows nothing of relations between the Apostle John and the Parthians.[2]

§ 43. The Minor Epistles of John.

1. Citations from the second besides the first Epistle of John first appear in Irenæus, in whose time the former was not yet separated in recollection from the latter. By calling the first one the larger, Clement of Alexandria shows that it is not the only one; and the Muratorian Canon recognises a *duas Joannis* (§ 9, 5; 10, 3). The third, a purely private letter, even if known could not possibly claim admission into the New Testament. Since Origen, however, the two smaller Epistles are constantly named together, but as Antilegomena. It may well be doubted whether they were ascribed to the Apostle either by Origen, who never used them, or by his pupil Dionysius of Alexandria, who in his critical examination of the Apocalypse refers almost exclusively to the larger Epistle; Eusebius expressly leaves the question from whom they proceeded, whether from him or from another of the same name, undetermined (§ 10, 7; 11, 1, 4); and Jerome directly states that they are attributed by most to the Presbyter John (*De Vir. Ill.*, 9, 11).[1] It is quite incomprehensible, however, how these two small Epistles, the former of which is in Irenæus directly coupled with the larger Epistle, could have maintained their position and acquired canonical authority in the Church at all, unless they had been handed down as Apostolic memorials. Nevertheless, on the basis of

[2] There is no foundation for thinking as Lücke does, that John is designated as *πάρθενος*; while to read *πρὸς τοὺς διασπαρσαμένους* with Holtzmann and Mangold after Wetstein and Michaelis, is purely arbitrary. The most likely thing is that a corruption has arisen out of *πρὸς παρθένους* and that there is an interchange, since Clement of Alexandria makes the second to have been written *ad virgines*.

[1] It is clear that this view is only drawn from the superscription of the Epistles, in which the author characterizes himself absolutely as *ὁ πρεσβύτερος* (2 John 1; 3 John 1), as the other John was commonly called after the time of Papias (§ 33, 2).

the passage in Jerome, Erasmus once more ascribed both to John the Presbyter, and was followed by Grotius, J. D. Beck (*Observ. Crit. Exeg.*, 1798), Fritzsche and Ammon. But apart from those who like Bretschneider attributed the Gospel and the Epistles altogether to the Presbyter, Credner, Jachmann (*Komm.*, 1838), Ebrard and Wieseler have defended the authorship of the Presbyter John. Yet it is intelligible enough that two short letters, referring to relations that were entirely concrete, should have more of an epistolary character than the large pastoral writing. And since both by their complete similarity of form betray the same hand (comp. 2 John 1, 4, 12 with 3 John 1, 3 f., 13 f.), while the former follows the large Epistle in such a way that it can only proceed from the same author, unless it be a copy without any object whatever, everything is in favour of both being attributed to the Apostle.

It may remain a matter of speculation how the Apostle, who does not give his name either in the Gospel or the first Epistle, was led to characterize himself as the πρεσβύτερος, whether on account of his great age (Credner, Bleek) or owing to his position of dignity as supreme director of the Churches (Lücke, Düsterdieck); but it is quite inconceivable how the Presbyter John, who only received the designation of his official position to distinguish him from the Apostle, could call himself the presbyter absolutely, although there were other presbyters besides himself even in the Church to which the Epistles went. Over against the resemblance which the second Epistle of John bears to the first in thought and expression, a resemblance that is obvious, the alleged differences (ἐρχόμενος ἐν σαρκί instead of ἐληλυθώς, v. 9: θεὸν ἔχειν) and peculiarities of expression (ver. 9 f.: διδαχὴ τοῦ Χριστ., διδαχὴν φέρειν) prove nothing whatever; nor can it be said with any certainty that John would in ver. 6 have written περιπάτειν ἐν instead of κατά, in ver. 10 f. ἐάν τις instead of εἴ τις, εἰς τὰ ἴδια instead of εἰς οἰκίαν, κοινωνίαν ἔχει instead of κοινωνεῖ, since the expression selected alone suits. All other peculiarities adduced are taken from the third Epistle where the reference to relations that were entirely concrete naturally led to the use of expressions that do not appear in the other Johannine Epistles. The assertion that these relations are inconceivable where Apostolic authorship is concerned, cannot be maintained.

2. The *second* Epistle of John is usually supposed to be

addressed to a Christian matron, but the substance of it is by no means in keeping with this assumption. For all Christians love her children (ver. 1); and after the Apostle has commended the walk of a certain few, he exhorts the mother to walk in the same way (ver. 4 f.). Although he specially addresses this person in ver. 5, yet the exhortation being always in the plural applies to her and to her children at the same time (vers. 6, 8), even where the duties of the housemistress are concerned (ver. 10 f.). In conclusion he sends greeting from the children of her sister, without mentioning the sister herself (ver. 13). From all this it is clear beyond doubt that the mother and children are in this case identical, viz. that the Epistle is addressed to a Church, either collectively or individually.[1] Ver. 4 does not imply that the author had shortly before made a visit there; rather does ver. 12, where he promises to go to them soon, exclude such a supposition. This Epistle presupposes relations exactly analogous to those of the first, but must have been written

[1] Clement of Alexandria in the Adumbrationes already speaks of the Epistle as addressed "ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine," on the ground of manifest confusion with 1 Pet. v. 13; but the supposition that the woman was called Electa (comp. also Grotius and Wetstein) is precluded by the ἀδελφὴ ἡ ἐκλεκτή (ver. 13). That she was called Κυρία, as most critics maintain, is linguistically impossible, since this would be calling her Κυρίᾳ τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ (comp. 2 John 1). Both are undoubtedly appellatives, as after Luther, Schleiermacher, Sander and Braune (*Komm.*, 1869) held, even though falsely assuming that the Epistle was addressed to a single individual. That this individual was Mary the mother of Jesus (comp. Knauer, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1833, 2), or was called Martha as Volkmar has discovered, are groundless conjectures. If we regard the Κυρία as a collective person it would not apply to the whole Church (comp. Jerome, Ep. 123, 12, and after him Hilgenfeld, Mangold and Lüdemann, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1879, 4), which is already precluded by ver. 13, but to an individual Church (comp. after earlier predecessors Michaelis, Hofmann, Ewald, Huther and Wieseler), called κυρία not however on account of its relation to the Lord (comp. Augusti, *Komm.*, 1801), but as being the *domina familiæ*. There is no reason for supposing with Thiersch that it was the Church at Ephesus owing to its metropolitan position.

earlier, since its main object is to demand a decisive separation from errorists (ver. 9 ff.; comp. i. 7), who in the first Epistle already seem to be excluded (§ 42, 2). Moreover the definite admonitions to love the brethren may here (ver. 5 f.) point to dissensions which disturbed the peace of the Church. The nature of these dissensions is, however, revealed in the *third* Epistle; for it is more than probable that mention is there made in ver. 9 of our second Epistle (comp. Ewald). In this case our Epistle cannot have been sent direct to the Church, but either to Gaius, to whom the third one is addressed, or more probably to a member of the Church called Demetrius (ver. 12),[2] since John tells Gaius, in ver. 9, of the letter. A certain Diotrephes, who probably held some office in the Church and sought to gain the pre-eminence, had calumniated the Apostle, and had not only succeeded in preventing the missionary he had sent from being received by the Church, but had also threatened those who would have received him, with excommunication (ver. 9 f.). It is evident that the Apostle is apprehensive lest he should likewise interfere with the reception of his Epistle by the Church if it came to them direct; and therefore he sends it to an in-

[2] Who this Gaius was, we do not know. That he held an office in the Church does not appear; he seems rather to have been a private person who had formerly distinguished himself by showing love towards travelling missionaries (vers. 3, 6). From the frequency with which the name occurs it is purely arbitrary to assume that he was Paul's host in Corinth, familiar to us from 1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23, and therefore that the Epistle was addressed to this Church (Koenen, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1872, 2), or with Wolf (*Komm.*, 1881) and Thoma that it was addressed to the Church at Pergamos because according to Const. Ap., 7, 46, a Gaius was bishop in that place. Two Christians of the name of Gaius also appear in Acts xix. 29; xx. 4. We know just as little of Demetrius, who is generally regarded as the bearer of the letter, which would then be chiefly a letter of recommendation on his behalf (comp. Lücke, Düsterdieck, Hilgenfeld and others); this however is not probable either from the wording of ver. 12 or from the substance of the Epistle; moreover the missionaries mentioned in ver. 6 ff. would as a matter of course have taken the letter with them.

dividual member, to whom he refers Gaius in words of high praise (ver. 12). The proximate aim of the Epistle is once more earnestly to commend travelling missionaries, probably the bearers of the letter, to the man of proved hospitality (ver. 6 ff.). The visit he promises to Gaius (ver. 13 f.) is naturally the same of which he speaks in 2 John 12; and the greeting to friends (ver. 14) is another proof that the Apostle had only a party in the Church still favourable to him. There is no indication that the coming forward of Diotrephes was connected with the false doctrine that threatened the Church, nor is it at all likely, for in this event the whole matter would have been treated from a different point of view.[3]

3. Naturally it is no easy task to explain why these two minor Epistles should likewise be regarded as products of the pseudo-Johannine tendency-literature, as it was necessary for the Tübingen criticism to make out. Baur's hypothesis, that they were addressed to the Montanistic portion of the Roman Church, Diotrephes being a symbolical name for their bishop, has found no assent. According to Hilgenfeld the second is an official writing of excommunication, an utterance of Apostolic condemnation with respect to the Gnostics; the third being an ἐπιστολὴ συστατική intended to vindicate the right of the head of the Church of Asia Minor to draw up such letters of recommendation for orthodox teachers, a right not yet universally conceded. How the author after his first Epistle could have felt it necessary to compress the substance of it into another second one; or how an

[3] Other assumptions with regard to the Epistles, viz. that they were written in Patmos (Hug, comp. § 42, 7), that they point to a visitation journey, as set forth by Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 24 (Huther), that they presuppose the teachings of the first Epistle and were therefore written after (Lücke, de Wette, Guericke), or even that 2 John ver. 10 f. is an indication of fiery youth, and that the Epistle is more powerfully written than the first which betrays the weakness of old age (Eichhorn); all these are of course mere conjecture.

Epistle whose purely fictitious relations are apparently so little adapted for the purpose, could have had the design attributed to the third, he has not explained. Hence Koenen contents himself with the idea that both were written by the author of the Gospel and first Epistle, for the sole purpose of showing by a reference to the Corinthian Gaius and to 2 Cor. xi. 4 (!) that he belonged to the Pauline-Johannine time. But although both have given up the attempt to supply these Epistles with a third pseudo-John as done by Baur (comp. also Mangold), yet Späth in the *Protestantenbibel* has advocated a different author for each of the two minor ones; and though they have for the most part been regarded as an after-drift of the pseudo-Johannine literature, yet Lüdemann (*ibid.*) has discovered that the two smaller are linked in a perfectly natural way to the Ephesian presbyter; whereas identification with the Apostle begins in the first Epistle and is completed in the Gospel. Holtzmann on the other hand already finds this identification in 3 John 12 (comp. Gosp. xxi. 24), but transfers the Epistles with Hilgenfeld to the time between 130 and 135, because the itinerant teachers presupposed in the Didache are found here likewise, although the relations 40 years earlier could hardly have been essentially different. It cannot be maintained that this criticism has promoted the historical understanding of the Epistles.

FOURTH DIVISION.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

§ 44. The Synoptical Question.

1. The first three Gospels that have been handed down to us manifest a striking agreement with one another, not only in the choice of what is told of the life of Jesus, but also in the arrangement of long narratives and in the manner of representation down to individual expressions. Each one has, it is true, something that is peculiar to itself; but parallel sections are continually met with, sometimes in two of the Gospels and sometimes in all three, that may be put side by side, for which reason these Gospels since Griesbach have gone by the name synoptical. In the old Church it was not indeed this agreement that was most wondered at, but the differences that existed along with it. Papias already expressed surprise that Mark should have given the sayings of the Lord in a different order from Matthew; and at the time of Clement of Alexandria the absence of genealogies in his Gospel was explained by the theory that the Gospels containing such genealogies were earlier written and had satisfied this want. Even at that time attempts began to be made to reduce Gospel texts to greater conformity, and to explain their deviations from one another as seeming contradictions only. Chrysostom says that their agreement testifies to their truthfulness, while ἡ δοκοῦσα ἐν μικροῖς διαφωνία removes all suspicion of collusion (*Hom.* 1 *in Matt.*). On the other hand Augustine frankly assumes that each Evangelist was acquainted with the work of his predecessor; and since the traditional succession was also regarded as the chronological one, Mark was in his view the *pedissequus et*

breviator Matthæi (*De Consensu Evang.*, i. 4). In accordance with the theory of inspiration which prevailed at the time of the reformation and was more and more sharply defined, the Gospels could be rightly examined from a harmonistic standpoint alone. The only critical question with which this period was occupied was that raised by Erasmus, as to the original tongue in which Matthew's Gospel was written; a question that was decided almost exclusively by dogmatic and polemic considerations. The Arminians, who modified the stringency of the old idea of inspiration, were the first who attempted to explain the relation between the three Gospels, and in this attempt naturally followed Augustine and his order of the Gospels, maintaining that Mark made use of his two predecessors Matthew and Luke. So too Hugo Grotius, Mill and Wetstein (1730). Compare also J. A. Bengel, *Richtige Harmonie der vier Evangelien*, Tübing., 1736; Townson, "Treatise on the Four Gospels," translated into German by Semler, Leipz., 1783. But Luke in his preface cast blame on his predecessors, according to an idea got from patristic times, for which reason it was natural to deny with Beza, that Matthew and Mark were among these predecessors, and rather to make Luke the earliest Evangelist (comp. Walch, Harenberg and Macknight). The Englishman Owen ("Observations on the Four Gospels," Lond., 1764) having already made the briefest Evangelist the epitomist of the other two, Büsching (*Harmonie der Evangelien*, Hamb., 1766) now held that Luke had been used by Matthew, both being excerpts from Mark (comp. also Evanson, "The Dissonance of the Four Gospels," London, 1792). But the Augustinian assumption of Mark's dependence on Matthew which here still forms the basis, was so shaken by Koppe in his *Programm* of 1782 (*Marcus non epitomator Matthæi*), that G. Chr. Storr (*Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte*, Tübing., 1786, comp. *De Font. Evang. Matth. et Luc.*, 1794) declared Mark on the contrary to be the earliest of our three

Evangelists. Thus the synoptical question was soon reduced to the dilemma, that Mark was either the root of the two other Gospels or an abstract of them; Griesbach's authority however (*Comm. qua Marci Evang. totum e Matth. et Luc. comm. descriptum esse monstratur*, Jenæ, 1789, 90) gave a preponderance to the second view.

Moreover J. Clericus (1716) and Priestley (1777) had already expressed the opinion that the agreement of our Gospels rested on the common use of older sources, a view accepted by Michaelis who had hitherto represented in his fourth edition (1788) the traditional form of the hypothesis of mutual use. This view specially commended itself to rationalism, which loved to represent the heretical Gospels as prior to our canonical ones. Stroth for example (1777) professed to have found in the Justinian *Memorabilia* (§ 7, 1) the Gospel according to the Hebrews (compare on the other hand Paulus in his *Exeget. krit. Abh.*, 1784), and Semler (*Anm. zu Richard Simon*, 1776–80) to have discovered a source of our Luke in Marcion's Gospel (§ 8, 6) which Löffler (*Marcionem Lucæ Evang. adulterasse dubitatur*, 1788) and Corrodi unhesitatingly declared to be Luke's prototype (comp. on the other hand Storr and later Grätz, *Krit. Unters. über Marcions Evang.*, Tüb., 1818; Hahn, *D. Evang. Marcions*, Königsb., 1823). Thus it came about that Lessing directly asserted the Gospel according to the Hebrews to be the root of the whole canonical and extra-canonical literature (*Neue Hypothese über die Evang.*, 1778). This hypothesis found much approval (with Niemeyer and Weber for example), but was already so far modified by Corrodi (1792) and J. C. Schmidt, that in place of the Gospel according to the Hebrews they put the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. When in 1793 the theological faculty of Göttingen made the Gospel question a subject for competition, the prize-essays of Halfeld and Russwurm both endeavoured to trace back the Gospels to common sources, only that the former assumed a multiplicity of such sources after the manner of Clericus; while the latter adhered to the view of one primitive Gospel. In fact the hypothesis of mutual use seemed to give no satisfaction in any form, since whatever order might be assigned to the Gospels, it could never be explained why the later writer should have changed the order of his predecessors in many respects, leaving out so much valuable material.

2. In the beginning of our century Eichhorn came forward with his famous hypothesis of a primitive Gospel. Out of the forty-two sections common to all three Gospels he constructed a short sketch of evangelical history said to

have been written about the time of the stoning of Stephen, in Syro-Chaldaic, and to have been given to the Apostolic assistants as a guide to their ministry. The sections common only to two Gospels he explains by assuming that several copies of this primitive Gospel were enlarged by additions, and that two of our Evangelists made use of the same copy; the strange mixture of agreement and difference in expression he explains by supposing that they had translated these partly themselves and partly with the help of translations already existing.[1] This hypothesis, though certainly pointing out the right way towards the solution of the problem, was nothing but a web of historical impossibilities in the form given to it by Eichhorn. Such a guide for evangelical preaching, of which moreover we find no trace in the New Testament, would be too much at variance with the spirit of Apostolic times. The preaching of the Gospel outside Jerusalem began quite accidentally, before there could have been any thought of linking it to a guide of this

[1] Eichhorn had broken with the tradition respecting our Gospels. The first could not proceed from the Apostle Matthew, on account of its legendary matter; the statements regarding the composition of the second he rejected on account of its connection with the fabulous abode of Peter in Rome; the reference of the third to a Pauline disciple is said to be connected with the misinterpretation of the *εὐαγγέλιόν μου* in the Pauline writings. Room was thus made for hypothesis. The hypothesis of mutual use in its various forms was shown to be unsatisfactory. On the other hand he gave a complete genealogy of the numerous Hebrew and Greek evangelical writings, concluding with our three Gospels which originated from various copies of the primitive Gospel partly agreeing and partly deviating, and were at the end of the 2nd century chosen by the Church out of a great number of evangelical books. Eichhorn had first propounded his view in the *Allg. Bibl. für bibl. Literatur* of 1794; but it was not until Hug objected that the coincident Greek expression of our Gospels could not be explained by a Syro-Chaldaic primitive Gospel, that he followed the Englishman Herbert Marsh ("Notes on Michaelis' Introduction," translated into German by Rosenmüller, 1795–1808) in introducing various auxiliary translations into his Gospel-genealogy, and thus in his *Introduction* of 1804 gave his hypothesis its final form.

nature, which moreover would have lost the only value it could have had, by the supposed enlargements. Besides, the idea of translators consulting other translations was quite foreign to primitive Apostolic circles, where both languages were equally familiar. Moreover the assumption that the Canonical Gospels originated in these explained neither their prevailing linguistic and literary peculiarity nor why they were chosen from a mass of evangelical writings such as implied indeed a singular love of writing. Finally this hypothesis did not on the whole get beyond that of mutual use, only that it transferred the latter back to the hypothetical preliminary stages of the formation of our Gospels. For Eichhorn's theory that Mark made use of a copy in which those employed by Matthew and Luke were already combined, has the hypothesis of Owen and Griesbach for a background; just as Marsh in his modification of the primitive-gospel-hypothesis makes a background of Storr's, and Kuinöl (*Komm.*, 1807) of Büsching's. Nevertheless the hypothesis made a great sensation; Ziegler (in Gabler's *Theol. Journ.*, 1800) and Hänlein adopted it; Gratz (*Neuer Versuch, die Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien zu erklären*, Tübing., 1812) endeavoured to simplify it, and Bertholdt to reconcile it with tradition; but after two decades it had already outlived itself, Eichhorn himself appearing to have doubts of it in his second edition (1820).

It was Hug who criticised the primitive-gospel-hypothesis with most acuteness, but he had nothing to offer in its stead except the hypothesis of mutual use in its traditional form. In all its other forms it found representatives likewise. Vogel (in Gabler's *Theol. Journal*, 1804) again made Luke begin, but reserved the last word for Matthew; while Ammon (*De Luca Emendatore Matth.*, Erl., 1805) revived the hypothesis of Griesbach, and Seiler (*De Temp et Ordine, quibus Tria Evang. Scripta sint*, 1805) that of Storr, only that Storr made the Aramæan Matthew precede Mark, whereas Seiler held the impossible view that the former was derived from the latter. By this means however the way was paved for a material distinction between the Aramæan and Greek Matthew, since the latter was now said to be a translation of the former with the assistance

of Mark who had already enlarged it. It is noteworthy how near criticism here was to the true solution, though still groping in uncertainty. Schleiermacher (*Ueber die Schriften des Lucas*, Berlin, 1817) endeavoured to carry out with respect to Luke's Gospel the hypothesis which Paulus had combined with that of Griesbach, of a use of several written digests in our Gospels, however little this mosaic construction could explain the essential uniformity of its language. On the other hand Herder's attempt (*Regel der Zusammenstimmung unserer Evangelien*, 1797), pointing out an entirely new way, went side by side with the hypothesis of a primitive Gospel. He found in Mark the earliest received type of that oral preaching formed in the Apostolic circle, and put him at the foundation of our Greek Matthew, which however he distinguished from the oldest Apostolic writing of Matthew; whereas Eckermann maintained that the earliest traditional type was fixed by the Aramæan Matthew (*Erklärung aller dunklen Stellen des N. T.*, 1806).

3. Gieseler followed up the ideas of Herder and Eckermann (*Histor.-krit. Versuch über die Entstehung der schriftlichen Evangelien*, Leipz., 1818). He attempted to demonstrate more fully, how a fixed type of narrative, a sort of oral primitive Gospel in the Aramæan language, must have been gradually formed in the circle of the primitive Apostles at Jerusalem, of which the Apostolic assistants bore the stamp. It embraced the public ministry of Jesus, especially in Galilee, but was now fixed now fluctuating according to the more or less frequent recurrence of isolated events. It was put into Greek in a peculiar form by Paul on his missionary travels, and was afterwards changed in other ways by the primitive Apostles when they left Palestine. Matthew and Mark went back to the later form, the latter modifying it still more, for foreign lands; while Luke, whose Pauline character is already exaggerated by Gieseler in the manner of the later tendency-criticism, returns to the earlier form. Oral tradition is said to have prevailed in the Church for a long time, until the conflict with heretics first gave rise to the need of common written Gospels, and Polycarp introduced our four into his Church. This hypothesis is based on premisses that are undoubtly correct; for the fact

that the missionary preaching of the Apostles was concentrated in the great fundamental facts of the passion and resurrection of Christ does not exclude the probability that recollected words and acts of Jesus were imparted for the edification of the Church. That these communications must in a large circle of eye-witnesses have been mutually supplemented and corrected, and owing to the poverty of the Aramæan language must gradually have assumed a stereotyped form especially in the parts recurring most frequently, is beyond doubt. But to suppose that this tradition-type was learnt by heart or even translated, is out of the question. Even if the hypothesis be freed from the mechanism still adhering to it in Gieseler's system, and which already precludes the possibility of the smallest trace of such a narrative-type being found in the fourth Gospel, it by no means explains the agreement of our Gospels; an agreement which is not limited to such points as words, or to fundamental features of the narrative, but frequently extends to finishing touches and details of expression, as also to introductory and transition formulas, and in many cases continues throughout long speeches and even series of narratives such as could never have been transmitted in oral tradition. Neither does it explain the deviations often apparently conditioned by literary motives and not by differences of recollection or the freedom of oral narrative, in so far at least as this very freedom, hitherto current notwithstanding the fixed fundamental type, allowed the same liberty to the Evangelists where their written material was concerned. Hence Gieseler's tradition-hypothesis, though unable to solve the synoptical question, has certainly put forward points of view of permanent fruitfulness for its advancement.

Notwithstanding the great approval this hypothesis at once met with (comp. Sartorius, *Drei Abhandlungen*, 1820; Rettig, *Ephemerides*, Giessen, 1824), it was soon recognised that without being combined with

others it was inadequate to the solution of the problem; and Griesbach's hypothesis having still found ingenious advocates (Saunier, *Ueber die Quellen des Marcus*, Berlin, 1825; Theile, *De Trium Prior. Evang. Necessitudine*, Lips., 1825), de Wette, Schott and Neudecker endeavoured not only to reduce the former within proper bounds but also to combine it with this latter. De Wette also adopted the view of one common source for Matthew and Luke, while Schott took the various digests mentioned in Luke's preface, as sources. The tradition-hypothesis was especially fruitful however on another side. In the dispute to which Bretschneider's *Probabilia* (1820) gave rise respecting the Gospel of John, it became necessary to pay closer attention to the differences between it and the synoptic Gospels. If John's held its own against the latter, the differences in question must be accounted for by the influence of oral tradition on our synoptic Gospels which had grown up out of it. None of them, not even the first, could in this case be a direct Apostolic writing, as de Wette directly demonstrated, following the precedent of D. Schulz, who in his "Doctrine of the Last Supper" (1824) had collected all the evidence bearing on the point. By this means an entirely new way was opened up to Gospel-criticism. Now for the first time the question of mutual use could be investigated with full impartiality: whereas an Apostle could never in fact bring himself to depend on the work of one who was not an Apostle, the latter could not make use of an Apostolic writing with the freedom which nevertheless actually existed. Moreover the historically-attested work of an Apostle thus became a new medium for the explanation of the relation between the Gospels, such as the primitive-gospel-hypothesis had sought to construct in an arbitrary way. Hence there was really no ground for despairing with Dr. Strauss (in his *Leben Jesu* of 1835) of all solution of the Gospel-question, or carrying the tradition-hypothesis to its extreme consequences for explaining our Gospels as the later deposits of a mythical formation that was already a hundred years old.

4. In the year 1832 Sieffert's work *Ueber den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums* (Königsb.) appeared. He showed unanswerably that tradition knows only an Aramæan Matthew; and that our Greek Gospel from internal evidence cannot possibly be a direct Apostolic writing. Hence it became necessary to regard the former simply as a reproduction of the latter.[1] Simultaneously Schleiermacher (*Stud. u. Krit.*,

[1] Comp. also Klener, *Recent. de Authent. Evang. Matth. quæst.*, Gött., 1832. When Sieffert himself attempted to separate the additions made by the compiler, he was unable to succeed, because being fettered by

1832, 4) examined the testimony of Papias with respect to a writing of Matthew and Mark, and came to the conclusion that these do not fit in with our two canonical Gospels, but only refer to a collection of sayings by Matthew and unarranged notes of Mark. Lachmann (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1835) was able to make the Greek Matthew originate in this collection of sayings and in the traditional historical narrative (comp. Schneckenburger, note 1) which is preserved in its purest form in our Mark (comp. also Herder, No. 2); while Credner traced it to the collection of sayings, and to the writings of Mark attested by Papias and worked over in our second Gospel (*Einl.*, 1836). But it was Weisse who first took the decisive step (*Evangel. Geschichte*, Leipz., 1838), by proving in opposition to Schleiermacher the applicability of the testimony of Papias to our canonical Mark. Knobel (*De Evang. Marci Origine*, Bresl., 1831) had already once more entered the lists for the priority of Mark in opposition to the current hypothesis of Griesbach, which Lachmann, Credner, Tholuck (*Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*, Hamb., 1837) also gave up in favour of his view. The above collection of sayings and our Gospel of Mark now became the only sources of the two other independent synoptists; the written primitive Gospel was found, whose combination with Storr's form of the hypothesis of mutual use threw an entirely new light on the synoptical question and relegated the dissolving view of an oral primitive Gospel, which still played so im-

Griesbach's hypothesis, he could not take into consideration the relation of the first Gospel to the second, and was therefore thrown back entirely on internal evidence. How little certain ground this afforded may be seen from the works which attached themselves to Sieffert. Whereas Schneckenburger (*Ueber den Ursprung des ersten canonischen Evangeliums*, Stuttg., 1834) connected our Matthew with Apostolic writings only through the medium of the Gospel according to the Hebrews (which had its origin in the collection of sayings and in Jewish-Christian tradition) giving it also the use of Mark and Luke, Kern (*Tüb. Zeitschr.*, 1834, 2) reduced the evidence of spuriousness and at the same time the compiler's additions, to a minimum.

portant a part with Sieffert and Schneckenburger, with Schleiermacher, Lachmann and Credner, more and more into the background. The view of Mark's priority among our synoptical writers constantly gained new adherents (comp. Sommer, *Synoptische Tafeln*, Bonn, 1842; Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schrift*, 1843; Credner, *Das N. T.*, Giessen, 1843), even among Catholics like Sepp (in his *Leben Jesu*, 1846); in face of which Griesbach's hypothesis could no longer be defended (Schwarz, *Neue Untersuchungen über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der syn. Evang.*, Tüb., 1844). The priority of Mark would probably have been established still sooner, if it had not at the same time been rendered suspicious by exaggeration and by intermixture with other strange hypotheses. In Mark, Wilke found the primitive Evangelist who freely moulded the traditional historical material in pursuance of literary aims; Luke is therefore to be explained by it alone; and Matthew, as the least independent of all, by both (*Der Urevangelist*, Leipz., 1838). He was followed by Bruno Bauer, who with his theory of a creative primitive Evangelist endeavoured to dissipate the last remnant of transcendentalism, at which Strauss afterwards still stopped half way (*Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, Leipz., 1841; *Der Syn. u. d. Joh.*, 1842). Hitzig, however, maintained that Mark was the Evangelist already praised by Paul in 2 Cor. viii. 18, and the author of the Apocalypse, by which suggestion he threw light on the linguistic peculiarities of the second Gospel (*Ueber Johannes Marcus und s. Schriften*, Zürich, 1843)

Notwithstanding all this, the criticism of Wilke put forward a new argument that was of great importance for the synoptical question. Not only did he throw much clearer light on the literary relation of the Gospels to one another, thus paving the way for later criticism, but also more strongly emphasized the literary motives and peculiar style of each individual Evangelist. The fundamental error of all former attempts to solve the synoptical question was that the same motive had more or less consciously been attributed to each Evangelist, viz. the wish to write as

complete and correct a history of Jesus as possible; a theory on which the procedure of the later writers must undoubtedly always remain unintelligible, whatever opinion might be held as to the sources and their order. How great acceptance this new point of view obtained even among critics of very different tendencies, is especially illustrated in the case of Ebrard (*Kritik. der evang. Geschich.*, Frankf. a. M., 1843), who thought that by consideration of the plan and subjective peculiarity of each Evangelist he could refute all criticism of the sources, and establish oral tradition as the only one. There was indeed forthwith no lack of exaggerations of this point of view, as in the case of the anonymous Saxon (Hasert), who made the Apostles Peter and Paul violently antagonistic in the Gospels, and traced their peculiarity to personal invective against one another (*Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander*, Leipz., 1845). His view was a caricature of the Tübingen tendency-criticism just emerging.

5 The Tübingen school openly expressed the opinion that the Gospels were not to be viewed under the aspect of historical documents, but that as a product of the dogmatic consciousness of the time they assumed new forms with its development. Hence they could not be looked upon as history any more than with Strauss who traced them to the myth-forming ecclesiastical consciousness; in place of the literary individuality emphasized by Wilke, we have here the tendency of each separate Evangelist to enter into the ecclesiastical development-process. But since none of our Gospels represented any longer the mutual antithesis which the school thought it had pointed out in the Apostolic period, they must have been the last deposit of a Gospel-literature mediating these original antitheses. With respect to Luke's Gospel Schwegler and Zeller (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1842, 43) had already attempted to show that Pauline universalism was here combined with Jewish-Christian particularism by the interweaving of Petrine and Pauline traditions. Ritschl (*Das Evangelium Marcions*, Tüb., 1846) taking up hints thrown out by D. Schulz (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1829) and following in the footsteps of Schwegler, thought he could directly prove that the basis of our Luke was the ultra-Pauline Gospel of Marcion (comp. No. 1). The original strictly Jewish-Christian

groundwork of Matthew was found in the (Petrine) Gospel according to the Hebrews, which Credner in his *Beiträge* (1832) again tried to demonstrate to be the Gospel of Justin. Thus it became possible now for Schwegler and Baur (*Krit. Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, Tüb., 1847) to find in the first and third Gospels the antitheses of primitive Apostolic Jewish-Christianity and Paulinism, though already weakened by the adoption of opposing elements; while they measured the third on every occasion by the first, which it had already used. By this means, with the help of Griesbach's hypothesis once more revived (comp. Zeller, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, 3, 4), Mark as the final mediator might be made the author of an entirely neutral Gospel. Consistently with this the origin of our Gospels was brought down to 130–170, a time when their canonization had hitherto been regarded as already complete. This original position of the Tübingen school was however maintained only by Strauss and Keim in their representation of the life of Jesus (1864, 67); although the latter considerably shortened the time allowed for the composition of the Gospels. A reaction took place within the school itself. That Marcion's Gospel was the original one, was first disputed, Luke being reinstated in his right of priority.[1] Then

[1] The lead was here taken by Volkmar (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850) and Hilgenfeld (*Krit. Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justins, d. Clem. Hom. u. Marc.*, Halle, 1850), after which Ritschl abandoned his view with respect to the Gospel of Marcion, and completed his breach with the Tübingen school by recognising the priority of Mark (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851). Finally Volkmar (*Das Evangelium Marcions*, Leipz., 1852) settled the question so thoroughly, that even Baur (*Das Christenthum und die Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, Tüb., 1853) was obliged virtually to surrender (comp. also Frank, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1855, 2). This reaction within the school was likewise represented by Köstlin (*Der Ursprung und die Komp. der synopt. Evangelien*, Stuttg., 1853), who interwove into Baur's scheme the Logia, the primitive Mark attested by Papias, another Petrine Gospel that had grown up on this foundation, a Jewish-Christian genealogy and the Galilean traditions, and thus sought to combine the results of the criticism of Schleiermacher and Weisse entirely rejected by the rest of

followed a long contest between Hilgenfeld and Baur, in which the former victoriously vindicated the priority of Mark to Luke and thus broke the spell of Griesbach's hypothesis even within the school itself. But his claim to have advanced Baur's tendency-criticism to the level of literary history is quite illusory, for in making a strictly Jewish-Christian writing the basis of the first Gospel as distinguished from its universalist remoulding, his point of view is purely dogmatic; and though more just to the literary peculiarity of Mark, who now once more occupies the middle place between Matthew and Luke as formerly, yet he interprets Luke's Gospel as opposed to Matthew in the interest of a tendency.[2] Of late Holsten *Die drei Ursprüngl., noch ungeschriebenen Evang.*, Karlsr., 1883; *Die synopt Evang.*, Heidelb., 1886) while adopting the same succession of the Gospels began to carry the tendency-criticism to its extreme consequences; the Petrine Gospel of Matthew being interpreted as the remodelling of an earlier one representing the anti-Pauline Judaism which afterwards predominated in the primitive Church, Mark as the Pauline antithesis, and Luke the intermediate Gospel. The Tübingen school could even adopt the Mark-hypothesis in the extreme form given

the school; but he only succeeded in producing an exceedingly complicated development-history which has found no other representative.

[2] The dispute respecting Mark's Gospel (Hilgenfeld, *Das Marcusevangelium*, Leipz., 1850; Baur, *Das Marcusevangelium*, Tüb., 1851) was carried on for years in the *Theol. Jahrb.* Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung*, etc., Leipz., 1854 and the new defences of his standpoint in his *Zeitschrift*, continued in his Introduction (1875) and afterwards (comp. the *Zeitschrift* of 1882, 1), in which he modified this standpoint, though not materially, by giving up a very shadowy Petrine Gospel which he had formerly foisted into the development series (comp. on the other hand Ritschl, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851), as also by declaring (after 1863) that the original Aramæan Hebrew Gospel, in a translation of the years 50–60, was the foundation of the canonical Matthew. Next to him stands E. d'Eichthal (*Les Evangiles*, Paris, 1863), who however derives Mark not from the canonical Matthew, but from its Jewish-Christian basis.

to it by Wilke. Volkmar (*Die Religion Jesu*, Leipzig, 1857; *Marcus und die Synopsis*, Leipz., 1870) interpreted our Mark as the primitive Christian epic of the first appearance of Christ, in the Pauline sense. On the other hand Jewish Christianity lifted up its head in the original Matthew, advanced Paulinism in Luke answered to it, the latter Gospel being worked over in our Matthew by a liberal Jewish-Christian (comp. H. M. Schulze, *Evangelientafel*, Leipz., 1361, 2. Aufl., Dresd., 1886). In Volkmar's view Gospel literature already begins with the year 73, whereas Hilgenfeld puts the original Matthew back into the fifties and concludes with Luke, about the year 100. Hence the school which promised to give a true solution of the synoptical question by genuine historical criticism for the first time, did not agree as to time, succession, or tendency of the Gospels.

6. The contest with the Tübingen school was begun by Ewald in his *Jahrbücher für biblische Wissenschaft*, after 1848; his own opposition to it only consisted in a return to the fundamental position laid down by Weisse, though he also maintained that the collection of sayings was followed by a very old Gospel of Philip already used by Paul, and Mark by a book of higher history (to which however he only assigned fragments of the oldest sources after all), while from Luke's Gospel he made out three other written sources discernible only by himself (*Die drei ersten Evang.*, Gött., 1850, 1871). His view, stripped of its eccentricities, was followed after 1853 by Meyer who had formerly adhered to Griesbach's hypothesis, though like Ewald going beyond Weisse, inasmuch as he affirmed that Mark had already used the Logia. Reuss maintained a position of complete independence with regard to the Tübingen school. Taking his stand on the two primitive writings attested by Papias, he affirmed that the second canonical Gospel used the original Mark, the first, the Logia and the canonical Mark, the third, this and other

sources besides. Reville went back entirely to Credner's *Einleitung* (*Études Critiques*, 1860). Following in the footsteps of Weisse who once more advocated his view in the *Evangelienfrage* (Leipz., 1856), we find Güder (in Herzog's *R.-Enc.*, IX., 1858), Tobler (*Die Evangelienfrage*, Zürich, 1858), Plitt (*De Composit. Evang. Syn.*, 1860) and Freitag (*Die heiligen Schriften des N. T.*, Potsd., 1861). The priority of Mark was adopted even by Thiersch in his *Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter* (1852), and by Jacobsen (*Untersuchung über die syn. Evang.*, Berlin, 1883) though from quite another point of view, for he tried once more after the manner of Bruno Bauer to explain the deviation from it in the other synoptics by all kinds of literary misconceptions, again made Luke entirely dependent on Matthew, by which means he was enabled to dispense with the view of any Logia, and separated from our Mark a genuine nucleus though comparatively wanting in substance. Griesbach's hypothesis was again revived by Bleek's Introduction published after his death (in essential agreement with de Wette) who therefore found it necessary to postulate a Greek primitive Gospel for Matthew and Luke, exactly corresponding to our Mark, only that use was made in it of older records of Apostles and eye-witnesses, such as have been found since Schleiermacher in the Logia. Delitzsch, Kahnis and Nösgen have also it is true expressed themselves incidentally in favour of Griesbach's hypothesis, but without putting it on a new foundation. The middle place of Mark and therefore the old ecclesiastical view is still represented by Aberle (*Tübingen Quartalschr.*, 1863, 1), Hengstenberg, (*Evang. KZ.*, 1865) and commentators like Bisping, Schanz and Keil; but also by Klostermann (*Das Marcusevang.*, Gött., 1867), who, though his endeavour to prove that Mark originated in the discourses of Peter was certainly exaggerated, yet discovered in it the use of a written source corresponding substantially to our Matthew. The apologetics according to which it is

necessary on dogmatic grounds to reject all use of sources, withdrew into the background behind the tradition-hypothesis of Gieseler. Guericke still hesitated to combine with it any form of the hypothesis of mutual use (comp. also L. Schulze); but Kalchreuter (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1861, 4) and commentators like Godet and Schegg think with Ebrard that it is possible to agree with it altogether. Finally Wetzel (*Die synopt. Evang.*, Heilbronn, 1883) has declared our Gospels to be three distinct transcripts more or less complete of what Matthew the Apostle narrates.

7. The chief work of recent times has its centre in the further construction of Weisse's hypothesis. B. Weiss thought it required amendment in two ways; he regarded the oldest source not only as a collection of discourses, as currently supposed since Schleiermacher, but though finding it to consist mainly of sayings of the Lord, endeavoured to prove that it contained at the same time a not inconsiderable series of fragmentary narratives; and with Ewald and Meyer held that this oldest source was already known to Mark, not to say used by him (comp. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1861, 1, 4; *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.*, 1864, 1; 65, 2). He carried out this view exegetically and critically in his two commentaries on Mark and Matthew (1872, 76) and embodied its historical result in his *Leben Jesu* (1882, 84). Holtzmann attempted to solve the difficulties left by Weisse's hypothesis, in another way, viz. by supposing that the written synoptic basis, which in his view held an independent position over against the Logia and was used along with the first and third Evangelists, was not our Mark, but that this stood next to it and was mainly an abridgment of it (*Die synoptischen Evang.*, Leipz., 1863). This hypothesis met with much approval; Schenkel (1864) and Wittichen (1876) making it the basis of their representations of the life of Jesus, and Sevin (1866, 73) of his synopsis and interpretation of the Gospels (comp. also Mangold in Bleek's *Einl.*, 3 Aufl., 1875). It soon became

evident, however, that the separation of Mark from the hypothetical primitive Mark, presented new and formidable difficulties. In the various modifications of this hypothesis by Weizsäcker (*Unters. über die evang. Gesch.*, Gotha, 1864), Wittichen (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1866, 4), Scholten (*Das älteste Evang., deutsch v. Redepenning*, Elberfeld, 1869),[1] Beyschlag, (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1881, 4; comp. on the other hand Weiss, *ibid.*, 1883, 4), and Feine (after Lipsius, *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1885, 1; 86, 3), Mark constantly assumed new forms, whose untenableness has repeatedly been shown by Weiss. In his last utterances the originator of this hypothesis practically gave it up. Wendt, like Jacobsen (No. 6), also renounces it (*Die Lehre Jesu*, Gött., 1886), and by once more adopting with Simons (*Hat der 3. Evang. den kanon. Matth. benutzt?* Bonn, 1880), Jacobsen, Mangold (in Bleek's *Einl.*, 4 Aufl., 1886) and now Holtzmann, the view of a use, though a subsidiary one, of our Matthew by Luke, and by furnishing the Logia-source with histories and parables specially taken from Luke, which were entirely foreign to it, has made it possible to explain the first and third Gospels with the exception of a few additions for the most part legendary, entirely from Mark and the Logia-source.

§ 45. The Oldest Source.

1. The oldest source owed its discovery to a perception that the first and third Gospel, although independent one of another, had nevertheless many parts of discourses in common which are not found in Mark, and yet resemble

[1] According to him this proto-Mark, which in the deutero-Matthew (as in Luke) is combined with the Logia, was practically an essential remoulding of an older sketch by John Mark, a conclusion at which Jacobsen (No. 6) also arrives by a critical rejection of strong interpolations out of our second Gospel, while the deutero-Matthew has in our canonical Matthew, which is used by the canonical Mark, been subjected to a second revision.

one another so closely down even to details of linguistic expression (comp. for example the ἐπιούσιον, Matt. vi. 11; Luke xi. 3) that they can only proceed from a second source common to both.[1]

The first example is afforded by the sermon on the mount, comp. Matt. v.–vii. with Luke vi. But in Matthew the Lord's prayer and the promise with regard to the hearing of prayer are found already interpolated (vi. 9–13; vii. 7–11), pieces which Luke gives with their historical occasion and in a connection which the reference of the latter to the parable of the importunate friend shows to have been original. In the same way the series of maxims with regard to anxious care and the laying up of treasure (Luke xii. 22–34), which are most clearly connected with the historical motive narrated in xii. 13–21, are interwoven in the sermon on the mount in an inverted order (vi. 19–21, 25–34). So too detached sayings that have their original connection in Luke are found interpolated in the sermon on the mount. Thus for example v. 13 (comp. Luke xiv. 34 f.), vi. 15 f. (comp. Luke xi. 33), v. 25 f. (comp. Luke xii. 58 f., where the original figurative sense is retained), vi. 22 f. (comp. Luke xi. 34–36), vi. 24 (comp. Luke xvi. 13), vii. 13 f., 22 f. (comp. Luke xiii. 24–27). Attached to the discourse on the sending out of the twelve Apostles, we find the series of sayings with respect to persecution (Luke xii. 2–12), impossible here because at variance with the historical situation, and moreover again in inverted order (Matt. x. 17–33), as also Matt. x. 34 ff. (Luke xii. 51 ff.); to the great discourse on the second Coming, pieces from a second discourse on the same subject are attached (Matt. xxiv. 26 ff., 37–41, comp. Luke xvii. 23–37) as also from a parable (Matt. xxiv. 43–51, comp. Luke xii. 39–46). In both, the discourse after the Baptist's message (Matt. xi. 2–19 = Luke vii. 19–35), the discourse against those who asked for a sign (Matt. xii. 39–45 = Luke xi. 29–36) and the discourse containing the invocation of woes (Matt. xxiii., comp. Luke xi. 39–52) are found independently. Frag-

[1] The possibility that the first Gospel could have got them from the third is already excluded by the obvious and recognised fact that the first has them for the most part in an undoubtedly more original text; while the possibility that the third could have got them from the first is excluded by the fact that the third frequently gives them in a detached form, either without alleging any reason, thus giving rise to a suspicion that they were selected by a pragmatic process, or with the accompaniment of short introductions which have historical probability entirely in their favour, whereas they appear in the first in artificial connection with others. Nor is there any lack of isolated cases in which the third has more fully preserved the original text or the connection.

ments of the discourse on offences in Matt. xviii. are found in Luke xvii. 1–4, and above all the parable of the lost sheep (Luke xv. 1–10); and Luke x. 13–15, 21–24 is found in Matt. xi. 21–27; xiii. 16 f. It is sometimes the case, however, that Luke has incidentally made a different application of detached sayings whose original connection is retained in Matthew (Matt. v. 18, 33 f.; xi. 12; comp. Luke xvi. 16 ff.).

A consideration of these fragments of discourses makes it clear that the common source cannot be regarded as a collection of discourses, as Weisse, Ewald and Weizsäcker held, nor as a collection of sayings, as it is generally designated. For the more comprehensive compositions made up of discourses with which the record of Jesus' sayings certainly did not begin, are unquestionably literary productions of the first Evangelist; and it cannot by any means be shown that isolated sayings were here recorded. Even parables hardly ever stood alone; but except when attached to other pieces of discourses, were put in pairs (comp. Luke xiii. 18–21 with Matt. xiii. 31 ff.) or in larger groups (Matt. xiii., Luke xii.), even where this can no longer be certainly proved, as in the case of the parables of the great supper (Matt. xxii., Luke xiv.) and of the talents (Matt. xxv., Luke xix.). They are rather to be regarded as larger or smaller groups of sayings turning on the same subject, or where they are called forth by a concrete occasion extending to small discourses.[2] It is true that in many cases they

[2] Only in the sermon on the mount have we a discourse with formal prologue and epilogue, which in the first Gospel is preserved in a very much expanded form, and in the third is very much abridged. Although the first Gospel has much that is given in a more complete and copious form than in the third, especially the series of sayings respecting offences (Matt. xviii.) with the parable of the wicked servant attached to it, yet it has scarcely preserved one actual piece out of the source alone. On the other hand we certainly have such a piece in the third Gospel, xiii. 1–9 (comp. also xiii. 31–33; xiv. 7–11; xxii. 35–38 and others), as also the allegory in xvi. 1–12, which perhaps in the source formed the pendant to xix. 11–27 (Matt. xxv. 14–30), and much that is at least more extended, where the first evangelist has only known how to turn the leading particulars of a series of sayings to account (comp. Luke xii. 54–59).

were strung together quite loosely (ἔλεγεν οὖν Luke xiii. 18, ἔλεγεν δὲ τοῖς ὄχλοις xii. 54, εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς xvii. 1, 22), but most of them had an historical introduction however short, which in the case of the discourse after the Baptist's message, and of the sayings with regard to prayer, solicitude and the laying up of treasure, already extends to a small narrative. We can even show three narratives of cures, which must have originated in the same source, for the very same reasons that apply to these fragments of discourses: viz. the centurion of Capernaum (Matt. viii. 5–13; Luke vii. 1–10), the dumb demoniac (Matt. ix. 32–34; Luke xi. 14 f.), and the healing on the Sabbath day, Luke xiv. 1–6 (comp. Matt. xii. 11 ff.). Add to this the fact that the first Gospel also contained fragments of preliminary history, as for example the words of the Baptist (Matt. iii. 7–12; Luke iii. 7–9, 16 f.) and the three temptations of Jesus (Matt. iv. 1–11; Luke iv. 1–13), of which the latter are mainly narratives; although the Lord's words form their proper point, while their connection with the words of the Lord that follow necessarily presupposes a certain historical framework.

2. But the reconstruction of the oldest source cannot stop with those sections exclusively retained in the first and third Gospels. Of some larger discourses only preserved in their full extent in these Gospels, or at least in one of them, detached fragments are likewise found in Mark.[1] Many

[1] Thus we find sayings from the missionary discourse (Matt. x. 5–16 = Luke x. 1–12) in Mark vi. 7–11 (comp. also Matt. x. 40, 42 = Luke x. 16 with Mark ix. 37–41), from the defensive discourse (Matt. xii. 24–37 = Luke xi. 17–23, xii. 10, vi. 44 f.) in iii. 22–30, from the series of sayings with regard to discipleship (Luke xiv. 25–35 = Matt. x. 37 f.; v. 13) in viii. 34 f., ix. 50, from the discourse on the dispute respecting priority (Luke xxii. 24–30 = Matt. xxiii. 11, xix. 28, xx. 16) in x. 42–45; x. 29–31. Note also that these discourses apart from some historical introduction, are quite inconceivable, as also that the healing of the demoniac in Luke xi. 14 f. manifestly formed the introduction to the defensive discourse (No. 1).

indeed suppose that we have here in Mark an independent tradition apart from that of our source; but this assumption is forbidden by the far-reaching similarity which exists in the Greek wording of these sayings, notwithstanding the freedom of Mark's rendering. Moreover almost all the sayings retained by Mark outside the connection of his narrative, may be traced to reminiscences of discourses and sayings whose presence in the source is already attested; and here too the same thing may be said of the diction.[2] That the parables preserved in Mark are independent of those contained in the source, is quite inconceivable; for the parable of the grain of mustard seed in Mark iv. 30 ff. is unquestionably a descriptive paraphrase of the first parable of the pair of parables in the source Luke xiii. 18–21 (No. 1), while the parable of the sower (Mark iv. 3-9) is found in an incomparably simpler and more original form in the source (Luke viii. 5–8); and Mark iv. 26–29 is a remould of Matt. xiii. 24–30.[3] So too the only larger discourse given by Mark, viz. that on the

[2] Mark i. 7 f. is borrowed from the words of the Baptist; iv. 24, x. 11 f. from the sermon on the mount; i. 2 from the Baptist's discourse; xi. 24 f. from the maxims with regard to prayer (Luke xi. 4, 9); viii. 12, iv. 21 from the discourse against those who asked for a sign (Luke xi. 29, 33); iv. 22, viii. 38 from the series of utterances with regard to persecution (Luke xii. 2, 9); ix. 42–47 from the discourse on offences (Luke xvii. 2=Matt. v. 30); the closing utterance in iv. 24 from the parable of the talents; xii. 38 f. from the invocation of woes. Wendt (comp. § 44, 7), who again asserts the mutual independence of a series of similar sayings in the Logia and in Mark, did not venture to carry out this view, or in other cases to make the first Evangelist interweave a saying from Mark in his use of the Logia or combine Mark and the source.

[3] But in this case the only other parable that Mark has, viz. that of the workers in the vineyard (xii. 1–9) must come from the source, for Matthew's text (xxi. 33–41) is in many ways seen to be more original; and the interpretation still retained in xxi. 43 is at variance with the application borrowed from Mark. It is not improbable that it there formed a parable-pair (No. 1) in conjunction with the allegory of the great supper, attached to it by the first evangelist (xxii. 1–14).

second coming (xiii. 5–31) must proceed from the source, especially as xiii. 9–13 is clearly an interpolation, obviously originating in a series of sayings already familiar to us in the source (Matt. x. 17–22=Luke xii. 11 f.; comp. also Mark xiii. 21 ff. with Luke xvii. 23); while the conclusion appended by Mark (xiii. 32–37) also contains reminiscences of pieces of the source already known to us (Matt. xxv. 13 ff.; Luke xii. 36 ff.). Here too the more original text is in many instances preserved in the first Gospel. But if it is once established that in Mark pieces of discourses are derived from the source common to the first and third Gospels, Mark ii. 24 ff., 28 must also be taken from a larger collection of sayings in which the utterances of Jesus respecting the keeping of the Sabbath were put together (Matt. xii. 2–8); so too Mark iii. 31–35, of which Luke viii. 19 ff. has preserved an incomparably simpler form, and Mark xii. 28–34, much more simply given in Matt. xxii. 35–40 (comp. Luke x. 25 ff.). The fact that we are not concerned here with isolated utterances of Jesus, but with discourse and counter-discourse, cannot surprise us in face of the temptation history contained in the source.[4]

3. For a methodical investigation of the oldest source, it is of decisive importance that it contained many pieces of discourses which are still preserved in Mark in a secondary form and connection (No. 2). And since we have also been able to show the presence of some pieces of narrative in the portions preserved only by the first and third Evangelists (No. 1), there is nothing to prevent our tracing to this source also such pieces of Mark's narrative as have a simpler and

[4] It is true we thus assume what cannot be proved until afterwards, viz. that Mark was not acquainted with our first and third Evangelists; but even here it is clear, that if he had followed them as extensively as he would have done if the case had been reversed, it would be impossible to understand why he should give the discourses in so fragmentary a form and scatter the elements of which they are composed hither and thither so arbitrarily.

more original form in the first Gospel, especially if Luke too retains traces of such a source. To this category belongs first of all the story of the Canaanite woman (Matt. xv. 22–28), where the motives of the change made by Mark (vii. 24–30) are so obvious, that the change is in truth not denied; then we have a series of stories, which in the first Gospel (and in many instances also in the third) are presented in a form so short, sketchy and withal so polished and condensed, that they cannot possibly be explained as an extract from Mark's richly coloured representation amplified by numerous details and yet constantly going back to the earlier narrative-form, by which the flow of the narrative is often injured. They are simply accounts of cures; but, like the centurion of Capernaum, the healing on the Sabbath-day, and the Canaanite woman, they are evidently told not so much on account of the cure, as for the sake of some word of Jesus spoken on the occasion, the recurrence of the same forms and turns of expression frequently pointing to a common source.[1] With these however must be classed three narratives which manifestly mark three epoch-making points in the life of Jesus, viz. the feeding of the multitude, the transfiguration, and the anointing, where a comparison

[1] The relation is most apparent in the account of the leper (Matt. viii. 2–4, comp. Mark i. 40–45) and the palsied man (Matt. ix. 2–8, comp. Mark ii. 1–12), in which cases it has recently been admitted by Feine (§ 44, 7), in the account of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Matt. ix. 18–25, comp. Mark v. 21–43 and with it the discussion between Holtzmann and Weiss, *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1878) and the healing of the lunatic (Matt. xvii. 14–18, comp. Mark ix. 14–27), whose origin in the oldest source is already shown by the concluding words (Matt. xvii. 20=Luke xvii. 6=Mark xi. 23) which undoubtedly belong to it. A reminiscence of the narrative of the healing of the two blind men is only found with Mark in the repetition of a similar narrative (x. 46–52). The textual relation also obliges us to reckon with these the account of the driving out of the devils on the other side of the sea of Galilee, introduced by the tempest on the passage across (Matt. viii. 23–34, comp. Mark iv. 35–v. 20) whose introduction in Matthew viii. 18–22 is necessarily traced to the source through Luke ix. 57–60.

of the text shows traces of an older representation throughout. While the first turns on the miraculous fulfilment of the apparently incomprehensible saying of Jesus in Matt. xiv. 16, the second has its climax in the voice of God speaking, Matt. xvii. 5, and the third in the prediction of death, Matt. xxvi. 12. But the same voice of God (Matt. iii. 17), as well as the baptism of Jesus with the words of the Baptist which precede (Matt. iii. 13–16), must therefore have been in the source, which must be an *à priori* assumption in the case of a writing containing the Baptist's words and the temptation of Jesus (No. 1).[2] Now a source which contained the Baptist's words, with the baptism and temptation of Jesus, must necessarily have had some kind of introduction, and the last piece of it which can be pointed out, viz. the story of the anointing, itself points, in the prophecy of the immediately impending death of Jesus, to the close of His history. In this case the portions of narrative contained in it must themselves have formed the boundary-stones according to which its collected discourses were divided; and it is highly probable that the formula marking them as such may yet be shown.[3] Little as a

[2] Thus indeed it is definitely shown that the conception of a collection of sayings such as Holtzmann constructed with exclusive reference to Luke, as an unorganized heaping together of greater or smaller pieces of discourses and parables does not correspond to the picture which a methodical investigation of this source gives of it.

[3] It is certainly the prevailing opinion that the recurring formula of transition in Matt. vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1 belongs to the first Evangelist. But this is impossible for the reason that its presence does not by any means correspond to the manifest divisions of the first Gospel. It is definitively excluded by the fact that the same transition-formula appears in Luke vii. 1 between the sermon on the mount and the narrative of the centurion of Capernaum, *i.e.* between two pieces which without doubt belonged to the source (No. 1), between which according to Matt. vii. 28 it also stood in the source; and by the fact that a trace of the same formula is also found in Luke ix. 28 in passing to the account of the transfiguration. The source must therefore have employed this formula in passing from the separate groups into which the discourses were divided to the pieces of narrative by which they were separated.

writing that had no continuous narrative was able or intended to arrange the different series of sayings and parts of discourses that had been collected, in their chronological order, although these were certainly in many cases put together on account of the similarity of their contents, yet it naturally sought in certain prominent events of the life of Jesus, which were undoubtedly stamped on the memory at least in their relative consequences, to find a guide for the division of the collected discourses and thus to gain a certain organization for its collected matter. Nevertheless the fact remains, that the writing did not aim at a chronological or pragmatic combination of what it communicated, nor yet at continuous narrative and biographical completeness.

A closer analysis of our three Gospels and of the way in which their composition is conditioned by the use of a common source, leads to a series of disclosures with regard not only to their substance, but also to their arrangement, which have at least great probability in their favour, as shown particularly by Weiss in his *Leben Jesu*. In accordance with this analysis the sermon on the mount formed the chief part after the introduction, and this was followed by the three great miracles of the first period, viz. the leper, the centurion, and the raising of the dead maiden. Then came the Baptist's message, the maxims with regard to the observance of the Sabbath and the first parable-discourse, which again led on to the expedition to the eastern side of the lake and the curing of the palsied man; incidents still belonging to the earlier time. Then followed the discourses on the sending out and the return of the disciples, and this section probably contained the great bulk of the discourses designated in the source as disciples' discourses, *e.g.* the discourse respecting the strife for precedence and the parables treating of the use of earthly wealth, and particularly the maxims with regard to prayer, to which examples of the hearing of prayer are attached (the Canaanitish woman and the healing of the blind men). The casting out of the devils then led on to the defensive discourse of Jesus, followed by the denunciation of those who demanded a sign, and the invocation of woes, which, considering that the source contained no account of the passion, must here be anachronistic though in keeping with the subject, and to which the prophecy of persecution was attached. The narrative of the feeding of the people was perhaps followed by the sayings with regard to solicitude and the accumulation of treasure; the parables of the second coming and the last exhortations to repentance ending with

the parables of the vinedressers and of the great supper, as also with the sayings regarding true discipleship (Luke xiv.) and the discourse on offences. Then followed the transfiguration with the healing of the lunatic and the discourses relative to the second coming, certainly belonging to the latter days of Jesus, to which the story of the anointing formed the conclusion. It is certain that much of this classification can only be conjectural, but undoubtedly much could be rectified and established by a more exhaustive analysis of our three Gospels, for example by fixing the place of the healing on the Sabbath-day (Luke xiv.), of the discourse regarding the greatest commandment or the promise to Peter (Matt. xvi. 17 f.) which was unquestionably in the source and therefore presupposes some statement of Peter's confession.

4. The first composition of a Gospel-writing is ascribed in ecclesiastical antiquity to the Apostle Matthew (Mark iii. 18), who is expressly designated in the first Gospel as the publican (Matt. x. 3). The same Gospel (ix. 9) identifies him with Levi the toll-gatherer, the son of Alphæus, who according to Mark ii. 14 was called away from the receipt of custom to follow Jesus.[1] The remark has frequently been made, that it is easy to understand how the toll-gatherer, who had greater facility with his pen than the other Apostles, should likewise have been the first who advanced beyond the immediate practical need of epistolary communication to literary records. Moreover Papias of Hierapolis states in Eusebius (*H.E.*, 3, 39) that he put the λόγια together in the Hebrew (*i.e.* the Aramæan) dialect. Although Eusebius unquestionably repeats words spoken by

[1] The view that the only thing here meant is a call into the wider circle of disciples, rests on a quite untenable idea of the nature and origin of this so-called wider circle of disciples. The fact that Mark only speaks of him in the list of Apostles as Matthew, *i.e.* given or given by God, without marking his identity with the former Levi, only proves that he first began to have this surname in the Apostolic circle, and that Mark had no precise knowledge as to when and how he received it. But there is not the remotest foundation for doubting the very early tradition represented by the first Gospel, or for adopting the view of an interchange, as done by Neander, Sieffert, Ewald, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, and others, after the example of Heracleon and Origen, Grotius and Michaelis. Of his later life we have no certain knowledge.

Papias, yet their substance is most probably derived from the Presbyter (John), whose communications respecting Mark's Gospel already presuppose a knowledge of this writing of Matthew's; so that the poor attempts which some have made to trace this testimony to an error on the part of Papias, are *à priori* without reason. It is only by the connection with what Papias has imparted respecting Mark's Gospel from the same source, that we learn that the *Logia* of which he speaks are the Lord's words, and why he expressly emphasizes the fact that every one was obliged to interpret this Hebrew record of the Lord's words as well as he could (that is when they were read in the Church to Greek-speaking Christians).[2] From the way in which Papias mentions the original language of this writing and speaks of the need of interpreting their Lord's words as a fact of the past, it is clear beyond a doubt that no Aramæan Matthew was at his time any longer in use, whether it had been put aside by a Greek translation or by Greek revisions. In any case it is evident from the connection in which he speaks of it, that Papias was not so much concerned to give an exact account of what this writing contained as to emphasize the fact that he had not given the Lord's words aphoristically or only incidentally, but had arranged them in good order and in their original connection (in series of sayings and discourses); yet in spite of this the way in which at the same time he characterizes Matthew alone,

[2] The words Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεταξατο, ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος therefore do not refer to written translations as is generally supposed, much less to enlargements and explanations of that earliest Apostolic writing (comp. Schleiermacher), which the wording absolutely forbids; they show moreover that the view that it was merely an assumption on the part of Papias that a writing designed for believing Hebrews must have been written in Hebrew (comp. also Hilgenfeld), is quite untenable, since he says nothing as to the work having this design, but rather infers its use in wider circles.

shows that he regarded this arrangement of the Lord's words as its proper object and its peculiar feature.

It is obvious that this characterization of Papias does not apply to an evangelical history such as our first Gospel contains, which begins with a detailed account of the infancy and concludes with an uninterrupted narrative of the passion and resurrection, which pursues a didactic aim in its historical matter as in its pragmatic reflections, and plainly represents itself as an original Greek writing.[3] But although Schleiermacher, and in spite of the opposition at once raised against him by Lücke and Frommann (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1833, 40) the entire criticism that attaches itself to Weisse, asserts that according to Papias the old Apostolic writing was *exclusively* a collection of sayings (comp. Weiffenbach, *Die Papiasfragmente*, Berlin, 1878, and Mangold), this does not by any means follow from his words. From the connection with what has been said respecting Mark, the chief aim of Papias is to emphasize the fact that Matthew has actually given the *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων κυριακῶν* missed by Mark, and not that in opposition to Mark he has recorded *only τὰ λεχθέντα*. Though the earliest narratives of the life of Jesus were undoubtedly intended only to give the occasion on which this or that momentous saying of the Lord was spoken, Papias certainly does not intend to say that Matthew had omitted from his collection these transmitted words of the Lord with the occasion of their utterance. It is not his aim to form a counterpart to a continuous narrative of Jesus; rather does this counterpart result from the fact that Papias does not speak of a Gospel of Matthew in which importance is attached to a classified arrangement

[3] Nevertheless not only apologists down to L. Schulze and Keil, but also critics like de Wette, Bleek, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Keim and others still reassert that Papias had only our Gospel of Matthew in view, unhesitatingly rejecting his statement as to its having been written in Hebrew, either as an error on the part of the narrow-minded man, as Eusebius calls him on account of his millennarianism, or as a legend handed down from the Ebionites, as for example Hug, Bleek and Keil (*Komm.*, 1877); or else accounting for it by supposing that Matthew himself (comp. Bengel, Guericke, Olshausen, Thiersch and L. Schulze) or some other simply translated it. But the attempt to prove from the misapprehended testimony respecting Mark, that Papias understood by the λόγια the *λεχθέντα καὶ πραχθέντα*, or to appeal in favour of this view to later Church usage, according to which the Gospels were called the λόγια *κυριακά* on account of their proper canonical import (§ 9, 1; note 1) or the Scripture revelation of God *τὰ λόγια (θεοῦ)* generally, is impossible; as if there could be any meaning in Matthew's making a collection of the λόγια in this sense.

of the Lord's words, but only affirms in general that Matthew undertook such a work.[4]

But even in Alexandria there was no knowledge but that the Apostle Matthew had written in Hebrew, since it was there said that Pantænus found among the Indians (*i.e.* in South Arabia) the Hebrew writing of Matthew formerly brought thither by Bartholomäus (Euseb., *H.E.*, 5, 10). That he did actually carry it to Alexandria, is an addition of Jerome's (*De Vir. Ill.*, 36), resting entirely on a misconception of the passage in Eusebius. On the contrary this writing was as little known in Egypt as in Asia Minor, although there might have been an interest there in saying that Pantænus had seen it among the Indians; but Origen (ap. Euseb., 6, 25) still adhered to the old tradition that Matthew wrote first in Hebrew (on the assumption of course that he wrote for the Hebrews). Even Irenæus is unable to prove that he takes his declaration on this point from Papias, for in his statement as to the time when the work was composed and the fact that it was intended for the Hebrews he goes beyond him (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1); and the circumstance that all the Fathers hold to this tradition with Eusebius (3, 24) is the more remarkable, since they unhesitatingly refer it to our Greek Gospel, without considering how this contradiction is to be explained. Jerome alone speaks of a translation of the Hebrew writing of the Apostle, but hazards no conjecture as to it origin (*De Vir. Ill.*, 3).

5. It is probable that at the time of Papias and Pantænus some early knowledge of the Hebrew writing of the Apostle Matthew still existed, but this being no longer present, it is

[4] It is worthy of note that the latest construction of the Logia (Wendt, comp. § 44, 7), though excluding from it all the narrative portions of Mark, inserts many such portions found only in Luke, thus simply giving up the reiterated assertion, that to put pieces of narrative into the source is to abandon the ground of Papias' testimony.

the less likely that the Fathers could still have had a sight of the work at the end of the 2nd century. On the other hand it was known that a Hebrew Gospel was in use among the heretical Ebionites, τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, from which Eusebius is said to have found Hebrew citations in Hegesippus, and in Papias the story of the woman who was a great sinner (*H.E.*, 4, 22; 3, 39). Hence Irenæus, who knew of the original Hebrew writing of the Apostle Matthew, freely credits them with the use of Matthew's Gospel (*Adv. Hær.*, I. 26, 2; III. 11, 7). Clement on the contrary and Origen his pupil, who know and employ the Hebrew Gospel (§ 7, 6, note 2; § 10, 6), regard it as an entirely independent work by the side of our Gospels, and know nothing of any connection with the work of Matthew (comp. also Euseb., *H.E.*, 3, 25; 27, who moreover seems not to have any knowledge of it). Nevertheless Epiphanius still proceeds so positively on the assumption that the Ebionites must have made use of Matthew's Gospel, that he derives the name καθ' Ἑβραίους from the circumstance that Matthew alone wrote in Hebrew; and yet he himself shows that the Hebrew Gospel with which he was acquainted was a very much falsified and mutilated Matthew (*Hær.*, 30, 3; 13), that it was in fact by no means our Matthew. Moreover the numerous extracts preserved by him out of it (comp. Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canonem receptum*, Lips., 1866, IV.) leave no doubt that it already makes use of Luke's Gospel in the form of it with which we are familiar, along with our *Greek* Matthew, so that a connection with the Hebrew Matthew is not to be thought of.[1] The older form of

[1] It contains most decided echoes of the introductory history in Luke i. 5 (comp. iii. 2 f.), of the account given of the baptism in iii. 21 f., even with the subsequent statement as to age in vers. 23, and of the choosing of Apostles in vi. 13, 15, as also of the form given by Luke in viii. 21; xii. 58; xxii. 15, to the words of the Lord. The characterizing of the lake of Gennesareth as Λίμνη Τιβεριάδος has even an echo of John vi. 1; xxi. 1; and the changing of ἀκρίδες in Matt. iii. 4 into ἔγκρις ἐν

this Gospel, in use among the Nazarenes, which, however, he knew only from hearsay, since he is unable to tell whether the genealogies are wanting in it too, is certainly regarded by Epiphanius as the Hebrew original of Matthew (*Hær.*, 29, 9); but Jerome, who both knows and freely uses it, must have been convinced that such was by no means the case, since otherwise he would not have ventured to translate it into Greek and Latin, as according to *De Vir. Ill.*, 2, he actually did. All fragments of it, however, that have come down to us in him and elsewhere show, notwithstanding all Hilgenfeld's endeavours to dispute the point, that even this form of it is by no means connected with Matthew's Gospel exclusively, that it perhaps even presupposes his *Greek* text, and is in any case quite a secondary gospel-formation already rich in apocryphal embellishments.[2] Jerome himself clearly distinguishes between it and

ἐλαίῳ (comp. Exod. xvi. 31) undoubtedly shows that the Greek text of our Matthew has been used. The Gospel according to the Hebrews known to Epiphanius certainly professes to be written by Matthew in the name of the twelve Apostles; but its introduction in the interest of a tendency clearly shows that the claim to identity with the writing of Matthew which did not originally belong to it is raised here for the first time. From this it appears that it is simply reversing the true state of the case to say that the Fathers inferred the existence of a Hebrew original of Matthew from the circumstance that the Ebionites possessed a Hebrew Gospel ascribed to Matthew. On the contrary, the fact that tradition knew of such a Gospel, gave rise to the assumption that the Hebrew Gospel of the Ebionites must be our Matthew (Iren.), and to the derivation of the name κατὰ Ἑβραίους from it (Epiph.); whereas in point of fact the Fathers, who are acquainted with the earlier forms of the work (Clem., Orig.), know nothing of this identity, and it is only claimed by the latest form of it known to us (Epiph.).

[2] The Lord's saying preserved in Ign., *ad Smyrn.*, 3, which Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 16) found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews translated by him, is connected with Luke xxiv. 36 f.; the narrative preserved in Papias, which according to Euseb., *H.E.*, 3, 39 was also in the Hebrew Gospel, is connected with Luke vii. 37; the appearing to James (*De Vir. Ill.*, 2) with Luke xxiv. 41 f.; the history of the baptism given by Jerome (on Isa. xi. 1) even betrays reminiscences of John i. 32;

the primitive Hebrew text of Matthew, which he believed to be still in existence in the library of Pamphilus in Cæsarea and among the Nazarenes in Syrian Berœa (*De Vir. Ill.*, 3). Afterwards indeed he must have convinced himself that the Hebrew Gospels to be found there were only copies (perhaps other forms) of the Hebrew Gospel; and it is only in defence of his former view that he emphatically states that they were mostly characterized as *Evangelium juxta Matthœum* or as *Matthœi authenticum* (*Adv. Pelag.*, 3, 2; *ad Matth.*, 12, 13). His commentary on Matthew certainly shows that he was not acquainted with a Hebrew original of Matthew, for he never makes use of it for purposes of explanation. The conjecture that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was in any way related to the Hebrew Matthew, or that we might learn anything regarding it from the fragments here preserved, must be entirely abandoned. All our knowledge of this book, that had already gone out of use in the time of Papias and was no longer known by those who came after him, is what he tells us of it.

6. The very fact that the form of the Lord's words as given in our first Gospel is the predominant basis of their citation in the second century (§ 5, 6; § 7, 2), shows that the Church was conscious of possessing in it the richest

iii. 34 (comp. also the *υἱὲ Ἰωάννου*). Echoes are elsewhere found of Luke iii. 3; xxiii. 19, of the form given to a saying of the Lord in Luke xvii. 4, of Luke's rendering of the parable of the talents and of the allegories in Luke xv., xvi. Even the recension of the story of the rich young man, known to Origen (*tract.* 8 *in Matt.*) presupposes the account of our Greek Matthew (Matt. xix. 16, 19), and the Nazarene Gospel must have contained the citation (Matt. xxvii. 9 f.), otherwise it would not have been inserted in an apocryphal Jeremiah; and perhaps the explanation *filii magistri eorum* in Jerome (*ad* Matth. xxvii. 16) may be traced to the Greek accusative *Βαραββᾶν*. Mangold indeed holds that it cannot certainly be shown that the Gospel according to the Hebrews came from a Greek text, and declares the idea of the Holy Ghost as the mother of Jesus to be a proof of Aramæan origin. On the secondary traits and apocryphal colouring, comp. Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, *Einleitung*, § 1.

treasure of authentically transmitted sayings of the Lord; and since according to Papias these were first collected by the Apostle Matthew, his Gospel must necessarily stand in close connection with this old Apostolic writing. Moreover since the end of the 2nd century the Fathers without exception look on the first Gospel as that of Matthew, although they know that it was written in Hebrew, showing that they must have had information that it was specifically connected with the former early Apostolic writing. Hence this oldest source, which we have found most comprehensively and faithfully preserved in the first Gospel, which moreover was known to Mark and employed in the third Gospel, can only have been the work of the Apostle Matthew.[1] In point of fact all that we have ascertained respecting its character, corresponds very exactly with the representation given of it by Papias. It was not a connected historical narrative, but was mainly intended as a collection of the Lord's sayings, these being given in their original order, in series of sayings and discourses of greater or less length. The assumption that it also contained words spoken by Jesus on the occasion of different acts and therefore individual narratives from the life of Jesus is the less at variance with Papias' statement, since these would serve to give a fuller knowledge respecting the (chronological) order of the discourses. The writing which lies at the basis of our three Gospels cannot however have been the primitive Hebrew work of Matthew itself, since they agree so closely in many instances in the Greek wording, but can only have been an old Greek translation of it; from the statement of Papias we see clearly how early the need of such a work arose,

[1] If with Holtzmann this source be construed as substantially a collection of sayings from Luke (comp. No. 3, note 3), or with Wendt as containing a series of narratives that are specifically Luke's (No. 4, note 2), it becomes incomprehensible how the Fathers could have arrived at such identification.

owing to the use of the Lord's sayings in Greek-speaking circles.[2] When therefore Irenæus says that Matthew wrote while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel in Rome, by which time he can only mean the second half of the sixties (after the persecution by Nero and before his death), he does not of course refer to our Greek Gospel but to the Hebrew work which he ascribes to Matthew. We are also led to the same time by the statement of Eusebius that Matthew wrote when he was leaving Palestine, in order to furnish the Hebrews with a substitute for his oral preaching (*H.E.*, 3, 24); for it is probable that Matthew, like most of the primitive Apostles, only left Palestine definitively after the breaking out of the Jewish war. The remarkable coincidence of these two independent accounts is however strongly in favour of the assumption that they have their foundation in historical recollections. Moreover the only indication given by the source itself as to the time of its composition, is perfectly in keeping with this view. For the ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω (Matt. xxiv. 15) can only have one meaning, if it is intended as an exhortation to the readers to fulfil the requirement attached to the last catastrophe in face of the prognostics of its approach foretold by Jesus. It was so natural, immediately after the first success of the Jewish revolution when the intoxication of victory had taken possession of the whole people, to call to mind the fact that it was only the fulfilment of the signs of the time announced by Jesus as significant of the beginning of judgment upon Israel, and that the time foreseen by Him for the flight of believers who wished to escape this judgment, was come. The narrative of Eusebius as to a prophecy imparted by

[2] The Hebrew foundation of this source does in fact consist in the frequent recurrence of ἰδού, καὶ ἰδού, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, in words like γέεννα and οὐρανοί, in the form of the name Ἱερουσαλήμ, in the entirely unperiodic diction, and in many particulars that are sufficiently obvious (comp. *ex. gr.* Matt. xvi. 17 f.).

revelation to the heads of the Church at Jerusalem which occasioned their flight to Pella (*H.E.*, 3, 5),[3] is only a legendary echo of the circumstance that this earliest Apostolic writing appeared about the year 67 and by its interpolation in Matt. xxiv. 15, with its unmistakable application to the historical situation, exhorted the Christians to flee.

Eusebius in his *Chronikon* puts the composition of Matthew's Gospel in the year 41, which seems to be based on the view that Matthew at the time of Acts xii. had already left Palestine; but to this idea he himself according to *H.E.*, 3, 5 did not probably adhere. Such determination of time has nevertheless become traditional. Of late Plitt, Hilgenfeld and others have again gone back to the fifties; but the circumstance that no trace whatever of a written record of the Lord's sayings is found in the Apostolic Epistles, is quite at variance with their view and only serves to confirm the above time. Most of those who adopt the view of a collection of sayings hold to the seventh decade. Compare Mangold.

7. In this earliest Apostolic writing we have manifestly found the primitive Gospel, which not only explains numberless points of agreement between the synoptical Gospels in their choice and presentment of the words and acts of Jesus, but has also impressed all the written Gospels with one indelible type; for even the Evangelists, striving after pragmatic presentation and biographical completeness, never quite got beyond their anecdotal way of making each piece of narrative or discourse follow the other in a sort of necessary sequence. This character belonged to the oldest source, not only because it was *à priori* intended simply as a collection of the utterances of Jesus, but because it manifestly grew up out of oral tradition and in truth had only the

[3] Later criticism (comp. after Colani, Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer, Keim, Hilgenfeld, Weiffenbach, *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, Leipz., 1873, as also Holtzmann and Mangold) has indeed in many cases made this account refer to a pamphlet or to a small Apocalypse, of which Matt. xxiv. (not to speak of Mark xiii.) is said to be a remould; but comparative textual-criticism teaches that the very section attributed to it forms the proper nucleus of the authentic discourse on the second coming according to the oldest tradition.

design of fixing the narrative-type in the form it had assumed in the Apostolic circle at Jerusalem (§ 44, 3). It is too generally overlooked that the attempt not only to fix separate utterances of Jesus, but to reproduce whole series of sayings in which He expressed his views on this or that subject, or even longer and shorter discourses held on particular occasions, almost forty years after His death, was inconceivable even in the case of an ear-witness, unless this material had long before actually taken definite form in the circle of ear-witnesses from the mutually supplementing and corrective recollection of its various members. So too we must account for the form of the narratives, polished and close and yet so pithy and complete in itself, in many cases making but a sketchy frame for some important word of Jesus, by the fact that the view was in that circle mainly directed to the reproduction of the utterances of Jesus; the frequent repetition of separate narratives only serving as an illustration of this or that truth. There was no aiming at historical detail, relations of time and place, or names and relations of persons besides Christ who played a part in the scene. And since the communications in this circle did not tend to satisfy the desire for historical knowledge, but to edification, more especially to the strengthening of faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, they did not relate to that which belonged to his natural human development, and therefore to the history of the infancy and youth of Jesus, but exclusively to His public life and Messianic activity. It has been said that if the source likewise contained narrative portions, such a writing would be quite inconceivable without a history of the passion. But apart from the fact that this could not possibly be given without a continuous historical narrative, such as our source neither offered nor was intended to offer, the very circumstance that it was a product of the oral type of narrative as developed in Jerusalem, sufficiently explains the want. For there could be no

object in imparting to that circle what for the most part was universally known, and had taken place before the eyes of all. The same thing explains the almost invariable limitation of the source to the Galilean ministry, for only the invocations of woe which were indispensable as illustrating the position of Jesus with respect to the authorities of the nation, and the discourse on the second coming, strictly confined to the circle of the disciples, probably belong to the Jerusalem activity. If the oldest Apostolic work was essentially the fixing in a written form, of recollections that had been gathered in the circle of the primitive Apostles and had already become more or less stereotyped in their mode of presentment, these earliest records must have been practically intended for purposes of instruction and edification. Thus the primitive-gospel-hypothesis itself is the first step to the solution of the synoptical problem only when associated with a right apprehension of the tradition-hypothesis.

§ 46. The Gospel of Mark.

1. The most striking peculiarity of the second Gospel is its descriptive character. It is not intended to give a chronological or pragmatic history of the public life of Jesus, but a picture of it. Hence the repeated descriptions of the thronging of the people to Jesus, of His teaching and healing activity, of the vain attempts of Jesus to forbid all report of His miracles, and of His ineffectual retirement into solitude (i. 32, 36, 45 f.; ii. 13; iii. 7 ff., 20; iv. 1 ff. etc.). In the case of a separate narrative the locality is specified and the situation depicted as clearly as possible, fulness of concrete details enliven the representation, Jesus' method of healing is vividly described (comp. the healing of the deaf-mute and of the blind man, Mark vii. 8), the separate traits of the transaction are fully accounted for, the relations explained, the emotions and gestures that accompany the acts

with the impression produced, are described. Hence the predilection for accounts of demon-expulsions, where the peculiar conditions and accidents of the afflicted persons afford the richest material for such descriptive detail (comp. i. 26; v. 3 ff.; ix. 18, 20, 26). In this Gospel we see clearly how the ministry of Jesus, beginning in the region of the sea of Galilee and making its centre in Capernaum, extended to ever-widening circles; and how His fame spread in all directions and attracted ever-increasing masses. Over against the enthusiastic populace we have the scribes and Pharisees, whose opposition which rapidly develops into deadly enmity brings into view a series of narratives chosen with design (ii. 1–3, 6); while the account of the final ministry of Jesus at Jerusalem places him once more in opposition to all the hostile powers and tendencies of the nation, to the high priests, the Pharisees and Sadducees, with the scribes (xi. 27–xii. 40), down to the Herodian party so frequently mentioned by Mark (iii. 6; xii. 13). Again we see how a band of zealous hearers separates from among the masses who are driven to Him solely by the need of having their sick healed, who at His entry extol Him as the Messiah and after the interval of a few days impetuously demand His crucifixion (iii. 34; iv. 10); we learn His relation to His kindred (iii. 26, 31 ff.); we hear of the ministering women who remained true to Him at the cross and even to the grave; of the unknown one who placed at His disposal the foal of an ass and a room for the Passover-feast; of the youth who followed Him stealthily to Gethsemane, of Simon of Cyrene who bore His cross, and of Joseph of Arimathea who provided His grave. Above all we see the growth of His relation to the disciples whom He gradually calls to be His companions, and from whose circle He chooses out twelve whose names are enumerated and whose constant weakness of faith and slowness of understanding are again and again pourtrayed (comp. No. 5, note 3), until Jesus devotes Him-

self entirely and exclusively to their instruction. But even from these there is again separated the closer circle of His confidential friends, among whom Peter is especially prominent. His great confession evidently forms an epoch-making climax of the narrative.[1] It is by no means correct to say that the Gospel is only concerned with the acts of Jesus. It is certain that no discourse, with the exception of that on the second coming (chap. xiii.) is given solely on account of its instructive matter. We have not a statement of what Jesus taught in the synagogue, but a description of the impression produced by His method of teaching (i. 21 f.; vi. 2). Chap. iv. explains how Jesus came to teach by parables, illustrating this by examples which at the same time make the meaning of His parables clear (comp. vii. 14–23). In a series of sayings which the Evangelist strings together in a chain, he describes His gnomologic form of teaching (iv. 21–25; viii. 34–ix. 1; ix. 34–50; xi. 23–25). But the Gospel is particularly rich in lively dialogue, giving us an insight into the striking way in which Jesus could answer interpellations and repel attacks. It is just because it presents the course of events so directly that he prefers the dialogue-form, making use of direct discourse, even to words of Jesus preserved in Aramæan.

In keeping with this mode of presentment we have the linguistic expression down to the smallest detail, the predilection for the descriptive

[1] In the account of the entry into Jerusalem the procuring of the ass's foal by the disciples is described at length, the short account of the purification of the temple is framed in by the cursing of the fig-tree with the instruction to the disciples attached to it, and the narrative of the Jerusalem activity concludes with the most minute instruction to His confidential friends respecting His second coming. In the narrative of the last supper the providing of it by the disciples and the unmasking of Judas play a part that has no connection with what is told of Jesus Himself; so too does the prediction to the rash Peter on the way to the Mount of Olives, the sleeping of the disciples in Gethsemane and the thoughtless blow with the sword, as also the denial of Peter at the scene of judgment. The Gospel might very properly be called the Disciple-gospel.

imperfect, for the vividly realistic historical present, for emphasizing the commencement of an act (ἤρξατο 26 times), for plastic, marked and richly-coloured expressions, more especially for diminutives and every form of climax (πολύς 43 times, πολλά 15 times, doubling the expression for the same thing, particularly the negative, and the combination of positive and negative), as also for the constantly recurring εὐθύς (40 times). Answering to the descriptive character we have the circumstantial particularity of expression, the recurrence of similar features expressed in almost the same way, the repetition of the same or cognate words, the noun instead of the pronoun, the abundance of pronominal and adverbial turns of expression, the paraphrasing of the finite verb by εἶναι with the participle. The language is strongly Hebraistic, as shown particularly in the simple form of construction, the sentences being carried on by καί and δέ; cases of participial construction are comparatively rare, but where they do occur are sometimes awkwardly heaped together. Peculiarities are found in the pregnant use of εἰς, of the narrative ὅτι, where the Evangelist himself shapes the diction, and a series of Latin words (κεντυρίων, κράββατος, ξέστης, πραιτώριον, κοδράντης, σπεκουλάτωρ, φραγελλοῦν) and phrases (ii. 23; xv. 15).

2. It is only by an entire misapprehension of this prevailing, clearly-stamped peculiarity of the second Gospel, that the Owen-Griesbach hypothesis (§ 44, 1) could arrive at the conclusion that it is an extract from the other two synoptics. The assumption that its occasional agreement with them is most easily explained in this way, inasmuch as the Evangelist, who avoids the longer discourses always leaves his former subject when these begin and passes over to the other Evangelist, is clearly untenable, since in the very points where the hypothesis professes to be able to prove this procedure, it is found to be a delusive appearance, while on other occasions it can be shown not to exist.[1] But in general the entire hypothesis that the second Gospel follows the first

[1] In order to avoid the sermon on the mount, we are told, Mark passes on in i. 21 to Luke, although in i. 22 he brings in the concluding words of the discourse (Matt. vii. 28 f.), and therefore only leaves his former guide after he had overpassed it. In order to avoid the sermon on the mount of the third Gospel, he returns in iii. 20, it is said, to the first, although he has previously made a transposition (iii. 7–12) which, as well as the expression, shows that he is influenced by the first Gospel, to which therefore he has already returned before Luke's sermon on the

and third alternately, is not verified; for in a section where Mark seems to follow the third (iv. 35–vi. 44), he suddenly interpolates Matt. xiii. 54–58, xiv. 3–12 and leaves out the saying in Luke v. 39, which is likewise wanting in the first; in another place where he seems to follow the first (vi. 45 ff.), he interpolates Luke ix. 48–50, not to speak of smaller additions, and leaves out such portions as are also wanting in Luke (Matt. xvi. 17 ff.; xvii. 7, 24 ff; xix. 28; xx. 1–16). Therefore even where he follows one, he must invariably have looked out and collated the parallel account of the other, a proceeding which in truth the hypothesis presupposes throughout; for it was thought to celebrate its chief triumph in proving that the text of Mark is in many passages a mixture of the two parallels. But it overlooked the fact that the predilection for abundant, and often apparently twofold expression (as in i. 42) is just a peculiarity of the second Gospel (No. 1); that in the passages to which it gives prominence the expression is shown to be peculiar to the Evangelist by entirely analogous passages in which its interpretation fails (comp. i. 32 with xvii. 2; ii. 11 with ii. 9, v. 41; iv. 39 with vi. 51), and that the appearance of such a mixture of texts must necessarily have arisen wherever each compiler adopted only one of each of the above abundant duplicate expressions. Such a mixture of texts, however, is quite inconceivable where in the middle of a section in which the Evangelist seems to follow one of the two Gospels exclusively, a single expression is suddenly borrowed from the

mount. It is no less an error to suppose that in iv. 35 he leaves the first Gospel for the purpose of avoiding the subsequent parables, since he previously adopts iv. 11 f., 21–25 from the third, and omits Matt. xiii. 24–30, 33, without going away from the first; and if he leaves it in xii. 37 in order to avoid the discourse in Matt. xxiii., he would not return to it after 7 verses in order to take an equally long discourse from it (Mark xiii. On the contrary in vi. 56 and ix. 40 he does in fact leave the third Gospel after having followed it for a long time, without being impelled to do so by the commencement of a long discourse, and in ix. 48 f. he omits a long discourse of the first Gospel without passing over to the third.

other (iii. 2, 5; v. 2, 21), or where his text is made up of the words of both, promiscuously interchanged (comp. for example i. 34; ii. 24). This combining of expressions, which appears as unnatural as objectless, is quite untenable if we consider that nothing of those peculiarities of expression in the first and third Gospels which are most characteristic of the two Evangelists, has passed over into the second, but that on the contrary it has assumed throughout a peculiar character of speech and representation (No. 1). But assuming that the author was acquainted with the first and third Gospels, his choice of material from them is inexplicable;[2] and moreover it is hardly conceivable how an author could make it his aim from two copious Gospels to produce a third which is meagre as compared with them, when in addition to two narratives of healing he had nothing to add but a few ornamental details; Keim's mockery of which, though in this case just, is only a satire on the combination-hypothesis to which he himself still adheres. This hypothesis is in fact the sole critical error, which has not only long prevented the simplest solution of the synoptical problem, but has also made it impossible to estimate the second Gospel in its peculiar character. So long as it is judged only by its deviations from the first and third Gospels, it remains absolutely incomprehensible.[3]

[2] Even if the omission of the longer discourses be explained by the objects of his composition, it is still incomprehensible how an epitomist could replace the shorter narratives of the first Gospel by the more copious and richly coloured representation of the third, especially as he did the reverse in the case of Peter's calling and the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth; or how, though mainly following the first, he could have left out narratives of healing such as are contained in ix. 27–31 or xii. 22 f., or the stories regarding Peter in xiv. 28–32, xvii. 24–27, and the end of Judas, as also so many details in the history of the passion and resurrection; or how, out of the rich contents of the third Gospel, which he nevertheless follows in the final touches of so many of his narratives, he could have adopted only what was the very poorest (i. 23–28, 35–39; iii. 13 ff; vi. 12 f., 30 f.; ix. 38 f.; xii. 41–44).

[3] Herewith fall at the same time all the hypotheses which assign to

3. The tendency-criticism of the Tübingen school thought it had found a new motive for working up the two larger Gospels into our second one, in the attempt to reconcile the antitheses in them by leaving out of the first what was offensive to the Gentile Christians, and out of the third what was offensive to the Jewish Christians, thus vindicating the standpoint of complete neutrality (§ 44, 5).[1] But a dogmatic tendency of this kind can only be ascribed to the second Gospel by complete misapprehension of its literary character (No. 1). To impose a tendency-character on a Gospel which so manifestly aims at description and vivid pourtrayal and in which an artless delight in narrating and word-painting evidently predominates, is only possible by arbitrarily interpreting its historical representation as allegorical, and in the most artificial way putting views into it that are as foreign as possible to the *naiveté* of the author. This Gospel is not by any means a purely historical work, but it is written with a religious object and adapted to the needs of the Church. Its didactic aim, however, has nothing to do with dogmatic questions or with the antitheses of the Apostolic age.[2] The fact that the only long discourse which

this Gospel an intermediate place between the first and third; for a dependence on the former alone is not only precluded by its prevailing literary peculiarity, but also makes the explanation of its deviations from it, especially in the choice and arrangement of material, still more difficult. These hypotheses however rest at least partially on correct observations, which must therefore be taken into account.

[1] In order indeed to measure this standpoint by what is left out of the other two Gospels, it is necessary to assume what was first to be proved, viz. the knowledge and use of them on the part of the Evangelist; and even within the school itself this was contested with respect to Luke by Hilgenfeld and Holsten, and by Volkmar with respect to both. But even the above alleged mediating rôle of the Evangelist is abandoned by the school itself, inasmuch as Hilgenfeld finds in him a mild Jewish Christianity tolerant towards Paulinism; Holsten and Volkmar on the contrary the specific Pauline standpoint impressed with all sharpness.

[2] It is manifest that a Gospel which avows the fulfilment of the decalogue to be the way to the attainment of eternal life (x. 17, 19) and yet

it gives is the one respecting the second coming, shows unanswerably that its chief aim was to strengthen hope in the second coming of Jesus; while the fact that the instruction to the disciples so emphatically put forward turns on the thrice repeated teaching of Jesus as to the necessity that He should suffer death (viii. 31; ix. 31; x. 33 f.), with the explanation of which it concludes (x. 45); and that it is repeatedly made prominent in the history of the passion how in accordance with the Scripture it was necessary that everything should happen thus (xiv. 21, 27, 49), shows that the Church needed above all to understand why it was necessary for Jesus to enter into His glory through death. A work which announces itself as a Gospel of the Son of God (i. 1), which brings Peter's confession to the Messiahship of Jesus to its climax (viii. 29), and finally makes even the heathen centurion concur in this confession (xv. 39), shows without doubt that it has no concern with disputed points of dogma, but with the strengthening of Christian faith in the saving mediation of Christ, which, having its foundation in His life and work on earth cannot be shaken by the death prophesied and explained by Him in its saving significance, and will find its final confirmation in the second coming which He promised.

4. But although the second Gospel is thus shown to be

allows that the Sabbath was only established as a blessing to man (ii. 27), and declares the knowledge of the priority of the duty of morality over that of worship to be a necessary condition of participation in the kingdom of God (xii. 33 f.), cannot occupy a tendency-position in the question of the law. A Gospel which regards the kingdom of David as having come with the Messiah (xi. 10), which makes Jesus declare Himself the King of the Jews (xv. 2) and in the most naive way retains the prerogative of Israel by twisting a saying of Christ, while at the same time it guards against a misunderstanding of its exclusive pretension (vii. 27); which first expressly introduces into the earlier words of Christ a presupposition of the Gentile mission (xiii. 10; xiv. 9) and yet nowhere makes the Apostles give the commission for it, is evidently far beyond the dispute about the Gentile question. Utterances, however, like x. 18; xiii. 32 show that the Evangelist has not inserted later Christological ideas into the Lord's words.

independent of the first and third, it is impossible to understand how it originated, without assuming the existence of some written source. The discourse on the second coming (chap. xiii.) is much too comprehensive to have been transmitted by oral tradition; and when critically analysed betrays a series of interpolations and additions so plainly taken from an original form of it that one such must have lain before the author in fixed written shape. But since these additions themselves may again be traced to pieces of discourses in the oldest source, the groundwork of the discourse must also be borrowed from it (comp. § 45, 2). We might rather assume that the fragments of Jesus' defensive discourse (iii. 23–29), of the discourse on the sending out of the disciples (vi. 7–11) or of the dispute regarding precedence (x. 29–31, 42–45) rest on independent oral tradition; but notwithstanding the great freedom with which these are rendered as compared with the more original tradition in the older source, their wording shows too great a resemblance to that of the first and third Gospels to admit of the supposition that they were formed independently of them.[1] It has already been shown in § 45, 3 by a series of narrative pieces, that it can only be conceived of as a richer and freer embellishment of a more simple form of narrative so familiar to our author that his adherence to it often disturbs the flow of his own description (comp. Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*), and which must therefore have lain before him in writing.

[1] The same thing may, however, hold good as § 45, 2 shows, not only of the parables of the second Gospel (Mark iv. 3–9, 26–32; xii. 1–9), but also of all the elements of the connected sayings in iv. 21–25; viii. 34–38; ix. 37–50; xi. 23–25, as also of the words of the Baptist in i. 7 f., of the denunciation of the scribes in xii. 38 f., and the sayings with regard to the Sabbath in ii. 24 ff., 28. The connection between the more original form of these sayings in the older source may be proved throughout; and the latter holds good also of the pieces iii. 31–35; xii. 28–34; but the form is always too similar to be put on an independent, literary footing.

Obviously this does not imply that the Evangelist copied these pieces of narrative or the sayings and parables in the written source and must therefore have drawn from it, but only that from his acquaintance with their written type in the oldest source, he had become so familiar with a particular wording of them, that it involuntarily influenced his rendering. A duplicate saying like ix. 35 (comp. with x. 43 f.) plainly shows that the same saying is at one time given with a distinct remembrance of its wording and at another time without such remembrance in an incomparably freer and therefore more independent form. So too in the healing of the blind man (x. 46–52) recollections of the narrative of Matt. ix. 27–31 are mixed with independent tradition, and the twofold repetition of the story of feeding the multitude can only be explained by assuming that the Evangelist regarded the independent tradition which he possessed of it (Mark viii. 1–8), and which differed from its fixed written form (Matt. xiv. 15–21), as a second history (comp. also the repetition of vi. 14 f. in viii. 28). Moreover the citation with which our Gospel begins, so foreign to its manner (i. 2 f.), the manifest secondary form of the voice from heaven at the baptism (i. 11) and the reference to the temptations of Jesus in the wilderness which is scarcely intelligible except on the presupposition of a more detailed account of them (i. 12 f.), point to an acquaintance on his part with an earlier writing. And since the second Evangelist undoubtedly had no knowledge of our first and third Gospels (No. 2), this writing can only have been the Apostolic source lying at the foundation of those two Gospels.[2]

[2] From this it is clear that the true problem of Gospel-criticism lies in the fact that although Mark not only proves itself independent throughout of the first and third Gospels, but, as we shall show, one of their sources, yet because in all pieces of discourses and narratives common to him with the above Apostolic source he shows for the most part only more or less free recollections of this source which they used, he has therefore a secondary text as compared with one of them

Advocates of an originality on Mark's part that was influenced by no previous written records of any kind, endeavour, it is true, to limit as much as possible the points in which our second Gospel shows a secondary text as compared with the first and third, not only where portions of discourses are concerned, but especially in narrative-pieces; that such do exist, however, even Wilke (§ 44, 4) cannot deny altogether, for which reason he adopts the view of a series of later additions to the text of our Mark. On the other hand the preconceived opinion that the oldest source was merely a collection of sayings (§ 45, 4), obliged Weisse to assign to the second Gospel-source a number of pieces common to the first and third Gospels alone, which according to the above preconception the first source could not have contained. By a consideration of both sides Holtzmann arrived at his hypothesis of a primitive Mark (§ 44, 7). According to him our second Gospel was not the direct source of the first and third, but a closely connected remould of a primitive Mark, which therefore in those points where the text of our second Gospel appears to be secondary, is preserved in a more original form in the first and third Gospels, and moreover originally contained a number of pieces which these alone have preserved but which are already omitted from our second Gospel. Owing however to the strongly marked linguistic and descriptive character of the second Gospel the portions originally belonging to it but now only retained in the first and third Gospels, would be immediately recognisable; which is evidently not the case. Hence Weizsäcker, who moreover discovered secondary portions in the second Gospel in far greater number than Holtzmann; in his construction of the synoptical fundamental writing once more removed the pieces attributed to it by Holtzmann and assigned them to the source

---

at times, and at times as compared with both, so that he seems to be dependent on them. Hence in opposition to the considerations which prove the priority of Mark, others may always be adduced, according to which the first and in many cases the third has a more original text as compared with his; and the attempt to dispute one series of considerations in the interest of the other is quite in vain. This holds good in particular of the considerations of Zeller who endeavoured from the stock of words in the Gospels to prove the dependence of the second on the first (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1843). The truth regarding them is that out of the reminiscences of the source so faithfully preserved in the first Gospel, an element originally foreign to the peculiar linguistic character of the second Gospel penetrated into it (ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἰδού, οὐαί, τότε) the plural οὐρανοί, the substantive ἔρημος), which is especially noticeable where an expression frequent in the source is but once preserved in Mark. Compare ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (xi. 25), ἄνθρωπος with the substantive addition (xiii. 34), θησαυρός (x. 21), γέεννα (ix. 43–47), ὁμοιοῦν (iv. 30), ναί (vii. 28) and the like,

of the discourses, to which alone they belong, but found the difference between the primitive Gospel and our second one in a series of more or less extensive additions; so that according to him the former was shorter than the latter, whereas Holtzmann represented it as longer. It certainly does not call forth confidence in an hypothesis said to be necessary for the explanation of existing facts, when its chief representatives are not agreed as to whether our second Gospel is an abridgment or an enlargement of the hypothetical primitive Mark. Considering the unique linguistic and descriptive character of the second Gospel, the latter view however is manifestly quite impossible; for though Holtzmann sought in vain to find any convincing mark by which to distinguish the hand of the compiler from that of the primitive Mark yet owing to the pieces that have been added to our second Gospel, Weizsäcker found it necessary to adopt the view, quite inconceivable where authorship in those days was concerned, that the reviser imitated the peculiar form of the work before him. It was therefore not to be wondered at, if Scholten again returned to Wilke, and reduced the distinction between the primitive Mark and our second Gospel to a number of unimportant additions;[3] while the later advocates of this hypothesis minimized the differences more or less, in opposition to Holtzmann and Weizsäcker. But then no motive whatever can be shown for a departure, after all so trifling, from an earlier Gospel writing.[4] Hence although the hypothesis of a primitive Mark undoubtedly makes many phenomena in the relation of our

[3] The proto-Mark which Scholten and Jacobsen have extracted from this primitive Mark or our second Gospel by purely internal criticism (§ 44, 7, note 1) has no longer anything to do with the synoptical problem.

[4] If the motive of placing a purely historical source side by side with the source of the discourses, put forward by Holtzmann but in itself improbable, is proved untenable by the circumstance that the second Gospel has retained more discursive material than according to him it has omitted, yet the traces of a specifically Roman revision to which Beyschlag points are entirely isolated, and explain only the smallest fraction of the deviations he admits. But whatever view we may take of the revision of a primitive Mark said to exist in the second Gospel, the adoption of the former makes it imperative to diminish the traces of a secondary form of presentation and of text in the latter as much as possible, in particular to look upon the manifestly simpler and more sketchy form of many portions of narrative in the first (and to some extent also in the third) Gospel as an abridgment, for which no motive whatever can be found (hence Feine, *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1886, 3, now assigns many of these shorter narrative forms to the primitive Mark), and to explain utterances in the source of the discourses and in the primitive Mark as independent tradition-forms, much too similar in wording not to be traced back to one common written basis.

parallel texts easier to explain, and seems by the assumption of two independent sources to simplify the synoptical problem, it must nevertheless be abandoned, because it cannot be reduced to a satisfactory form and only gives rise to other greater difficulties, as even its originator virtually admitted. Compare § 47, 3; § 48, 2.

5. The Gospel begins by showing how the appearing of the Baptist was quite in keeping with the Old Testament prophecy of the forerunner of the Messiah, and that he referred to the Messiah who was to come after him (i. 2–8); going on to tell how Jesus of Nazareth was anointed with the Spirit at His baptism, declared to be the Messiah, and by His temptation in the wilderness directly proved as such (i. 9–13).[1] The *first* part (i. 14, 15) begins with His public appearance in Galilee, whose Messianic character is at once revealed by a condensed announcement of His kingdom and by the calling of the first disciples (i. 14–20). It presents a picture of the teaching and healing activity of Jesus, which centres in His appearance in the synagogue at Capernaum, and His first visit there to the house of Simon (i. 21–38), giving an entirely favourable impression of His ministry. The Evangelist puts the healing of the leper which was probably the first account of healing in the Apostolic source (§ 45, 3) into the wandering life of Jesus then commencing, because he believed that by it he could show the height of enthusiasm to which His activity roused the nation (i. 39–45).—The *second* part gives a counter

[1] Although the description of the Baptist (i. 4–6), which fully exhibits the Evangelist's peculiar manner of representation, certainly proceeds from the hand of the latter, which is likewise seen in the short allusion to the baptism and temptation of Jesus, scarcely intelligible, at least in i. 12, without an older and more copious account; yet in i. 7 f. the Baptist's discourse is manifestly taken from the Apostolic source; and since among the Old Testament citations that are quite foreign to him and are therefore often (as by Simons and Weiffenbach) erroneously said to be spurious, i. 2 certainly proceeds from the same source (Matt. xi. 10 = Luke viii. 27), i. 3 may likewise be traced back to it with the greatest probability (comp. Matt. iii. 3; Luke iii. 4).

picture of the opposition which Jesus met with from the Scribes and Pharisees, in its beginning and rapid growth to deadly enmity (ii. 1–3, 6). The Evangelist intimates in the clearest way that the narratives here combined to enhance the opposition, partly in form and partly in essence, are not put together according to time but according to matter. Only in the healing of the paralytic (ii. 1–12) do we find a narrative of the older source characteristically enlarged and embellished; while the narrative of the plucking of the ears of corn which belongs to tradition is in ii. 25 f., 28 extended by some maxims with regard to the Sabbath. All the rest proceeds from his own hand.—The *third* part (iii. 7–vi. 6) shows how even among the constantly gathering masses (iii. 7–12) the distinction between the susceptible and insusceptible became more marked. Full of significance throughout, it receives its frame as it were from the choosing and first sending out of the Twelve (iii. 13–19; vi. 7–13), who as His constant companions and co-workers stand out pre-eminent. The narrative in iii. 20–35 and the parable in iv. 1–34 then show how from the great mass of the people a narrower circle of susceptible hearers became separated, whom He characterizes as His true relatives, and to whom He can give not only the parables, but also their interpretation which is withheld from the insusceptible masses of the people.[2] Insensibility however soon made its appearance

[2] The way in which the refutation of the calumnious accusation of being in league with the devil (iii. 22–30), which is quite foreign to the point of view of the section, is parenthetically inserted in the former of the two pieces, is only intelligible on the assumption that Mark found them in this connection in the Apostolic source; from which, moreover, he has taken scarcely anything except a few parables which appear to be specially characteristic. The beautiful parable-trilogy of chap. iv. borrows the separate allegories from the same source, the second one perhaps in consideration of the point of view running through it in a peculiarly abbreviated and altered form. But the most significant thing in the Gospel in this connection, viz. the conversation respecting the object of the parable and its interpretation (iv. 10–20), as also the

even where His healing activity was concerned, for on the east coast He was driven out in consequence of the healing of a demoniac; and on the west coast when He spoke of raising up the child He was laughed to scorn (chap. v.). From this point of view the Evangelist has combined and embellished two large pieces of narrative belonging to the oldest source as shown by the fact that the narratives of crossing the lake (iv. 35–41) and of the woman who had the issue of blood (v. 25–34), which have nothing whatever to do with this point of view, are adopted only because they were inseparably bound up with them there. Moreover Jesus finds the same insensibility to His teaching and healing activity in His native city (vi. 1–6); and from the missionary discourse of the source, only those words are retained which refer to the insensibility which the disciples too would meet with (vi. 10 f.), apart from the words which merely describe their setting out (vi. 8 f.).—The *fourth* part is the most artistic in its construction (vi. 14–viii. 26); it shows Jesus at the height of His activity among the people, but at the same time prepares us for its discontinuance. It begins with an account of the spreading of Jesus' fame to the king's court, on which occasion the narrative of the Baptist's death is rehearsed (vi. 14–29). It is then grouped round the two accounts of the feeding of the multitude, which show Jesus surrounded by many thousands (vi. 30–44; viii. 1–10); each of which is followed by a stormy conflict with the Pharisees (vi. 54–vii. 13; viii. 11–13), an example of the insensibility of the disciples (vii. 14–23; viii. 14–21) and a narrative of healing which shows that Jesus no longer intended to exercise His healing activity amongst the people as such (vii. 31–57; viii. 22–26). It is manifestly the author's intention to show how experience of the in-

introduction and conclusion (iv. 1 f., 33 f.) belong entirely to his hand, from which the intelligent combination of the series of sayings (iv. 21–25) also proceeds.

creasing malice of His opponents and of the great need His disciples still had of instruction, moved Jesus to give up His ministry amongst the people and to withdraw entirely into the circle of His disciples.[3]—Hence the *fifth* part now shows (viii. 27–x. 45) how Jesus devotes Himself entirely to the instruction of His disciples. It groups itself round the triple instruction as to the necessity of His suffering which is therefore intended as the principal subject. The first of these, which is expressly connected with Peter's confession (viii. 27–33), is followed by a series of sayings mostly taken from reminiscences of the oldest source, setting forth the necessity that His disciples too should suffer, but at the same time pointing to the nearness of the Lord's second coming (viii. 34–ix. 1), for which a guarantee is given to the three intimate disciples in the transfiguration on the mount, an event closely connected with it in time.[4] The second prediction of His sufferings (ix. 30 ff.) is followed by the instructions to His disciples connected with the dispute regarding precedence, in which many reminiscences from the oldest source occur (ix. 34–50). On the other hand the subsequent instructions respecting marriage and children

[3] How predominant these points of view are, is seen in the circumstance that the narrative of the night-crossing (vi. 45–51) is manifestly told only on account of the insensibility of the disciples then observed for the first time (vi. 52), but afterwards described with ever-increasing frequency (vii. 18; viii. 17 f., 21). So too the sole portion of the oldest source (except the account of the first feeding of the multitude), which is inserted in vii. 25–30, is only added in connection with the journey into heathen lands, where the conduct of Jesus is intended as an illustration of His saying with regard to clean and unclean (vii. 24–31). On the other hand the account of His entrance there (viii. 11–13) scarcely shows any reminiscence of the parallel description contained in the oldest source.

[4] It is clear that this narrative is taken from the oldest source, from the fact that the healing of the lunatic, which is entirely foreign to the point of view by which this portion is characterized, is connected with it because it was closely joined to it in the source; only that to both the Evangelist attaches his own instructions to the disciples (ix. 9–13, 28 f.).

(x. 2–16), respecting riches and compensation for the sacrifice of them (x. 17–31) down to some very freely treated reminiscences (x. 11, 15, 29 ff.), are quite original.[5] The third prediction of His sufferings when setting out for Jerusalem (x. 32 ff.) is followed by a conversation with the disciples, which ends with a very free reminiscence of sayings from the oldest source and with the utterance regarding the saving significance of His death (x. 35–45).— In the *sixth* part (x. 46–xiii. 37) the healing of the blind man at Jericho forms an introduction to the entry into Jerusalem (x. 46–xi. 11), to which the cursing of the fig-tree and the purification of the temple are attached (xi. 12–26). Jesus then appears once more in conflict with all the leading powers in Jerusalem, the chief priests (xi. 27–xii. 12), the Pharisees and the Sadducees (xii. 13–27), the scribes (xii. 28–40). Down to separate sayings (xi. 23 ff.; xii. 38 f.), the parable of the vineyard (xii. 1 ff.) and a reminiscence, manifestly very freely handled, of the conversation respecting the greatest commandment (xii. 28 ff.), we owe everything here to the hand of the Evangelist, even the charming story of the widow's mite (xii. 40–44); it is only in chap. xiii. that the description of the Jerusalem ministry closes, with the great discourse on the second coming drawn from the oldest source.—In the *seventh* part, viz. the history of the passion (chap. xiv., xv.) all that is interwoven from the source is the narrative of the anointing in Bethany; the rest belongs entirely to the Evangelist. With the scene at

[5] That these instructions, which are attached to definite events, are also given for the sake of the former, and are arranged purely in accordance with their matter, is already shown by the succession in which the subjects are taken. It cannot therefore be said that x. 1 begins a new section in the sense of the Evangelist. On the contrary the remark that Jesus finally transferred the scene of His activity to Judea and Perea, belongs only to the last visit to Capernaum, where alone Jesus still remained incognito (ix. 30, 33), and therefore to the definitive cessation of His Galilæan ministry; for the author shows that there too He devoted Himself mainly to His disciples.

the open grave, where the resurrection of Jesus is announced by the mouth of an angel, and a promise given that He will appear to the disciples and to Peter (xvi. 1–8) the Gospel closes.[6]

6. Tradition ascribes the second Gospel to Mark, and constantly characterizes him as the disciple, companion, or interpreter of Peter. Without doubt he is identical with John Mark (§ 13, 4; 15, 1) familiar to us from the Acts of the Apostles, and whom we find in Cæsarea in company with Paul (§ 24, 5, comp. also § 27, 3).[1] We learn from

[6] The present conclusion (xvi. 9–20) in which nothing is told of the appearing in Galilee so expressly announced, but on the contrary a few of the appearances of the Risen One known to us from the later Gospels are briefly mentioned in an epitomized form, sharply contrasted with the whole descriptive detail of the Gospel, ending with a discourse visibly connected with the conclusion of our Gospel of Matthew, as also with a reference to the ascension and the preaching of the disciples undoubtedly does not belong to our Gospel, with whose language it is characteristically at variance. At the time of Eusebius and Jerome it was still wanting in almost all manuscripts, and is even now absent from our oldest and most important (*Sin.*, *Vat.*). Sure traces of it are first found in Irenæus and Hippolytus. Notwithstanding all this however it is still defended by R. Simon and Eichhorn as also by Hug and Guericke; in particular by the adherents of Griesbach's hypotheses (comp. also Hilgenfeld). Compare on the other hand Wieseler, *Comment., num loci Marc.* xvi. 9–20 *et Joh.* xxi. *genuini sint.* Gött., 1839. That the Gospel had originally a different conclusion (compare Ritschl who tried to restore it from the conclusion of our Mark, and Volkmar who restored it from Matthew), or remained incomplete, are entirely groundless assumptions.

[1] According to Acts xii. 12 he was the son of a certain Mary with whose house in Jerusalem Peter, who repaired thither immediately on his release from prison, must have been closely connected; which is confirmed by the fact that Peter calls him his spiritual son. Since according to Colossians iv. 10 he was an ἀνεψιός of Barnabas it is easy to understand that through him he was brought into relation with Paul (Acts xii. 25); a relation which after temporary estrangement (xv. 37 ff.) must have been again restored (Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11). In the meantime he may very probably have been with his spiritual father in Babylon (§ 40, 5), and may afterwards have attached himself to him completely; so that it was quite arbitrary to distinguish two different Marks as done by Schleiermacher and Kienlen (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1832 *u.*

the preface of Papias of Hierapolis (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 39) that the Presbyter (John, comp. § 33, 2) had already informed him that Mark had accurately recorded all that he still remembered of the words and acts of Jesus, though without arrangement; in explanation of which statement he himself tells us that Mark was not an immediate disciple of the Lord, but of Peter, who had not given an orderly collection of the Lord's words but had made use of them according to requirement in his discourses.[2]

These statements exactly suit our second Gospel, which in its vivid details obviously points to the testimony of an eye-witness, which is as much taken up with external history as with the inner development of the disciples, which gives a disproportionate number of stories of the disciples and a series of statements emanating from the circle of Jesus' three intimate disciples; of which the entire first part centres in Jesus' first visit to the house of Peter, of which Peter's confession forms the climax, and which concludes with a reference to the appearance of the Risen One to Peter. The Presbyter's remark as to the want of arrangement can of course only refer to its deviation from the order of the discourses and acts in a writing with which he was familiar and whose arrangement he regarded as the original one; and this can only have

1813) after the example of Grotius. When Irenæus speaks of him as the *ἑρμηνευτής* of Peter (*Adv. Hær.*, iv. 1, 1), he does not mean by that an interpreter who was his medium of intercourse with Greek and Latin-speaking people as W. Grimm (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1872) and Bleek still maintained; but according to Jerome (*Ad Hedib.* 11) a secretary who assisted him in writing the Epistles. But compare Note 2.

[2] It was formerly very generally overlooked, but since Bleek, Steitz (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1868, 1) and Holtzmann it has been more and more generally recognised, that Papias accurately distinguishes between the information given by the presbyter and his explanations, in which in a certain sense he justifies Mark in face of the blame attached to him in the *οὐ μέντοι τάξει* (*ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτε Μάρκος, οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*). From the former we learn moreover that the designation *ἑρμηνευτής* as applied to Mark had not originally the sense attributed to it by Jerome (Note 1), but only referred to the fact that by his written record he had made the Church acquainted with the communications of Peter (*Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν*); from the latter, that Mark was not one of the seventy disciples (*οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου, οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ ὡς ἔφην Πέτρῳ*), as later tradition assumed (Epiph., *Hær.* 51, 6).

been the old writing of the Apostle Matthew of which also he had told Papias (§ 45, 4). This writing, so far as we can ascertain, had in many respects quite a different order, especially in the discourses so frequently taken out of their connection by the second Gospel and newly linked together; a fact to which Papias, who probably only knew the order from our first Gospel, gives prominence. But when the Presbyter praises his accuracy and Papias his completeness (*ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς*), this again corresponds entirely to the wealth of detail with which Mark has in many cases enriched the sketchy narratives of the oldest source, and to some extent corrected them (comp. *ex. gr.* v. 23 with Matt. ix. 18). Hence it was obviously a blunder on the part of Schleiermacher (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1832) to say that the account of Papias does not suit our Gospel.[3] It is thus assumed that Papias (or the Presbyter) spoke only of unarranged records, of which indeed it is difficult to form an idea, and these are said to have served at most as the foundation for a Gospel so well arranged as our second next to the hypothetical primitive Mark. But since neither the Presbyter nor Papias knew the *actual* order of the words and deeds of Jesus, their judgment with regard to the defective *τάξις* of Mark obviously cannot be estimated by what appears to us in the present day to be a good arrangement either chronologically or pragmatically, but only by the *τάξις* of the earliest Gospel with which they were acquainted; not however the Gospel of John as maintained by Ewald. Whereas Baur indulged in wonderful conjectures as to the nature of the writing mentioned by Papias; his disciples who broke through the limits of Griesbach's hypothesis, as for example Hilgenfeld

[3] His close connection with one of the eye-witnesses, more especially with Peter, can only be mistaken when everything that agrees with the first and third Gospels is, under the influence of Griesbach's hypothesis, regarded as borrowed from them; but it is hardly conceivable how Weiffenbach and Beyschlag could revive Schleiermacher's view. Nor is the fact that the first Evangelist was likewise able to adduce isolated Petrine narratives (Matt. xvi. 17 ff.; xvii. 24 ff.; xviii. 21 f.) any argument against the view that the second Gospel proceeds from the communications of Peter; while the circumstance that Matt. xv. 15 and Luke viii. 45; xxii. 8 directly name Peter instead of the unnamed disciples in the second Gospel, only proves that they too trace its traditions chiefly to Peter's recollections. Those who hold that the Petrine discourses of the Acts and the second Epistle of Peter are genuine, can also appeal to the fact that special prominence is given in Acts x. 37 f. not only to miracles of healing but also to the expulsion of devils, just as here (comp. Mark i. 32, 39; iii. 11); and that the history of the transfiguration appears in 2 Pet. i. 16 ff. as a guarantee of the prophecy of the second coming, just as in Mark.

and Volkmar, recognised the fact that the account of Papias referred to our second Gospel.[4]

Justin already characterizes our second Gospel simply as the ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου (*Dial.*, 106, comp. § 7, 2), and Tertullian says: "Marcus quod edidit evangelium Petri adfirmatur" (*Adv. Marc.*, 4, 5). Irenæus too states that after the death of Peter and Paul, Mark τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παρέδωκε (*Adv. Hær.*, IV. 1, 1), in which he entirely agrees with the oldest account, for Papias and his Presbyter evidently assume that when writing Mark consulted only his memory, so that Peter was no longer living. Hence the idea that Mark's Gospel contains references to Peter, by no means originated in the desire to procure Apostolic sanction for it; for Clement of Alexandria confesses in the most naive way that he knows nothing of such a work, and even Origen makes no reference to it, Eusebius and Jerome being the first to give an account of it, of whom the latter seems to regard the Gospel as directly dictated by Peter.[5] So too it is Eusebius (*H. E.*, 2, 15) who first sup-

[4] Those who adopt the view of a primitive Mark naturally make the account of Papias refer to it (comp. for example Mangold), as Jacobsen in his critical separation of the groundwork of the second Gospel. Only isolated critics have adhered to a quite unfounded scepticism with regard to the statements of Papias. Wendt makes those respecting Mark refer to a series of narratives, which, with a complete misapprehension of the composition of the second Gospel, he thinks he can critically separate from it, and thus practically goes back in substance to Schleiermacher. Yet in the same exaggerated way as Klostermann in his Gospel of Mark (comp. § 44, 6) he holds that they contain oral accounts of Peter which had received a fixed form, but maintains that along with other less certain traditions they were freely worked up by Mark into a chronological coherent representation for which they were not designed; an idea in glaring contrast indeed with the decisive importance he attaches to this source.

[5] Speaking of the composition of the Gospel, about which the Apostle's hearers are supposed to have interrogated him, Clement says (ap. Eusebius, *H. E.*, 6, 14), ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι. The assumption here that the Gospel was written while Peter was still alive, does not agree with his assertion

ports Clement's attestation of Mark's Gospel having been composed in Rome, by a false interpretation of 1 Pet. v. 13, and combines it with the Simon legend (comp. § 39, 4); so that suspicion has been attached to that account without any reason whatever. On the contrary the explanation of Aramæan words and Jewish customs (vii. 3 f., 14, 12; xv 6, 42) is in favour of the assumption that the Gospel was written for Gentile-Christian readers; while the reference to the Roman practice of divorce (x. 12), the reduction of a coin to the Roman quadrans (xii. 42), the presumption of a knowledge of Pilate on the part of the readers (xv. 1), as also the numerous Latinisms of the Gospel (No. 1) obviously point to its having been written in Rome.[6] The tradition of the second Gospel having been composed by Mark would receive most remarkable confirmation, if the frequently expressed conjecture were assured, that the

that the Gospels with the genealogies were written first, which, notwithstanding his appeal to the old presbyters, is manifestly an error. It originated in an attempt to explain the absence of the genealogies in Mark (§ 44, 1) and was perhaps originally connected with the mistaking of our first Gospel for the Apostolic Matthew, and of Luke for the source from which he drew his genealogy, which therefore may very probably have been older than Mark. Origen adheres to the opinion that it occupied the second place, and holds that the matter was supplied solely by Peter (ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ), which does not necessarily imply that Peter supplied it during his lifetime (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25). It is Eusebius himself who, in speaking of the writing forced from Mark by the hearers of Peter, first says that Peter κυρῶσαι τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (ii. 15) and in favour of this statement appeals quite erroneously to Clement, who according to the passage he himself quotes, says the contrary. Jerome who (*De Vir. Ill.*, 8) simply follows Eusebius, says (*Ad Hedib.* 11) that the Gospel of Mark "Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est."

[6] The opinion expressed in old manuscripts and translations, that on this account it must originally have been written in Latin (comp. on the other hand § 16, 7, note 1), was defended by Baronius in the interest of the Vulgate, but has been given up even by the Catholics since Richard Simon. Chrysostom's transfer of the origin of the Gospel to Alexandria, is connected with the fact that Mark was afterwards supposed to have founded the Church in that place, manifestly on account of his relations with Barnabas.

youth of whom xiv. 51 f. contains a notice otherwise quite incomprehensible, was the author of the Gospel. For since the young man crept after Jesus and His disciples from the house in which they kept the Passover, nothing is more natural than to infer that this son of a Jerusalem house was the son of that Mary whose house afterwards served as a refuge for the disciples of Jesus (Acts xii. 12).

7. After Peter's death, when Mark began to note down his recollections of what the Apostle had told him of the acts and discourses of Jesus, it could not of course occur to him to give a chronological or pragmatic history even of the public life of Jesus; for the communications of Peter consisted only of isolated details; at most he had strung together, according to the requirements of his discourses, events that seemed to him to have a similar significance, rehearsing utterances of Jesus on the same subject one after another, without regard to the time or occasion when the former took place and the latter were spoken. It was only in the history of the passion that Mark could give a somewhat connected account partly of what he himself had seen, and partly of what he had gathered from those who witnessed the crucifixion. Hence he could only attempt to give a picture of the public life of Jesus by grouping kindred narratives in such a way as to throw light on its various aspects, in particular on the Master's relation to the people, to his opponents and to his disciples, on its different epochs and the gradual progress of its development, so far as he could form an idea of it from the fragments of tradition to which he had access. From this naturally resulted a writing such as is presented by our second Gospel in its literary peculiarity and composition, a writing which in its descriptions as in its pictured details produces throughout a vivid impression that it is the narrative of an eye-witness. What he found in the oldest Apostolic writing (No. 4) might probably supplement his recollection here and there, regulate his

combinations, and exercise a more or less involuntary influence on the details of his description; but could not have a pervading influence on his composition, which followed entirely different aims by different means.[1] The doctrinal standpoint of the Gospel (No. 3) of itself brings us to a time when the declining hope of the second coming was in urgent need of reawakening on account of the apparent postponement of that event; and it became necessary to show how even in the facts of His earthly life, apart from His glorious return, Jesus had sufficiently attested the Messianic character of His mission. We found already an indication of this decline of hope in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 21, 3; 32, 2) and in the second Epistle of Peter (§ 41, 1), which finally called forth the chief product of Christian prophecy (§ 35, 1) in the Apocalypse. Between the former and the latter writings comes in the Gospel of Mark written after the death of Peter. Though the immediate connection between

[1] It is quite in vain to appeal, in opposition to the view of an acquaintance with this Apostolic writing, to the fact that the oldest tradition knows nothing of it. Apart from the question as to whether Papias or rather his Presbyter was fully informed of all the conditions under which Mark's writing originated, their declarations make no claim to discuss these conditions under every aspect, but only give prominence to what in their eyes was of most importance and explain their peculiarity as distinguished from the old Apostolic writing. Even on the above assumption the fact remains that by far the greatest part of the Gospel has its origin in recollections of communications made by Peter; for even in those sections where the Gospel comes in contact with the former Apostolic writing, what is drawn from these communications is far more than what was known to the narrator from that Apostolic work. The statement that an Evangelist acquainted with the rich discourse-material of the former writing would naturally have communicated more of it, is only a remnant of the idea that made all solution of the synoptical question so long impossible, viz. that every Evangelist must necessarily have noted down all that he knew or could ascertain of the life of Jesus. It was an entirely different aspect under which he put together a picture of the life of Jesus from his recollections; and therefore he had only taken out of the substance of the discourses, apart from that on the second coming, what he could attach to a definite situation and turn to account in his descriptive representation of the life of Jesus.

the second coming and the catastrophe in Judea is undoubtedly already broken (xiii. 24) in it, yet we find no reference whatever to the destruction of Jerusalem which had already taken place, even in the case of a prophetic saying such as is recorded in xiii. 2; on the contrary the form of the saying in ii. 26 leads rather to the inference that the shew-bread was still laid out in the temple.[2] We are thus referred to the end of the 7th decade, a time when Matthew's writing which originated in the year 67 was very probably known already in Rome in a Greek translation.

§ 47. The Gospel of Matthew.

1. As a matter of fact the entire substance of Mark is taken into our first Gospel even down to small unimportant parts whose omission explains itself on the clearest grounds (comp. No. 5). The materials of it are here however for the most part found in the same order, without exception from chap. xiv. onward, although this order is in many cases not chronological, but rests on matters of fact contained in the

[2] Although Bleek, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Beyschlag, Mangold and others maintain that the second Gospel cannot have been written before the year 70 on account of xiii. 24, where Mark however only quietly changes the εὐθύς into an ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις; yet the Apocalypse proves the contrary, for it separates the destruction of Jerusalem from the second coming by the whole of the last times of tribulation, though still written before the catastrophe (§ 35, 4). But the fact that no closer allusion, such as is directly made in the second or third Gospels, to the circumstances under which the destruction of Jerusalem actually took place is anywhere found, is the more significant since the prophecy of xiii. 2, which can hardly be connected with it, is undoubtedly first recorded by the Evangelist. It is impossible indeed to go back with Hitzig and Schenkel to the last of the fifties. Volkmar made a definite calculation that it was the year 73; Hilgenfeld was obliged to come down to the early time of Domitian, viz. to the first of the eighties, because he assumed a use of the canonical Matthew; and Keim even came down to the 2nd century (115–20) because Mark was in his view the youngest of the synoptics; while Baur for his part went beyond the middle of the second century (130–70). Herewith every support for a more exact date falls away.

composition of the Gospel, and for the most part is not recognised as such by our Evangelist but is taken as chronological, or loses its original motive in the connection given to it.[1] Moreover in the section v.–xiii. where the Evangelist forms the sequence independently and in so doing breaks through that of Mark in many instances, what is manifestly connected in substance is in some cases torn asunder (ix. 1–17 and xii. 1–14; viii. 18–34 and ix. 18–26), while the new order rests essentially on points of view which had been fixed by Mark. So too in chaps. v.–ix. the description of the teaching and healing activity of Jesus only carries out in a more extended way the point of view taken in the first part of Mark; while in chaps. x.–xiii. the description of the insensibility and hostility encountered by Jesus combines the second and third parts of Mark (§ 46, 5). Even in those delineations peculiar to himself the Evangelist is dependent on Mark (comp. *ex. gr.* iv. 23–25 with Mark i. 14, 39, 28; iii. 7 f.). In the mass of the narrative part, however, the account of the first Evangelist is throughout seen to be secondary; and conditioned in its deviations by literary motives. Localities and persons are more exactly defined; explanatory, amplifying and embellishing additions are made; while entirely new features are inserted in the text of Mark. Words that

[1] The connection of the group of narratives in Mark ii. 1–iii. 6, clearly marked as a connection purely of subject, is in Matthew ix. 9, 14; xii. 9 manifestly taken for one of time; similarly Matt. xiii. 1, comp. Mark iv. 1; xix. 13, comp. Mark x. 13; xxii. 23, 34, 41, xiii. 1, comp. Mark xii. 18, 28, 35, 38 and oftener. In the passage Matt. xii. 15 f. the connection is explained in a way that is historically inconceivable; while in xiv. 12 f. an obvious anachronism has even arisen from a misapprehension of the sequence in Mark. In other passages the connection of time in Mark is at least more strongly marked (xii. 46; xviii. 1; xix. 1) and explained in a way that is historically untenable (iv. 12). The evening cures (viii. 16) lose their motive in the Gospel before us, for it is not recorded that it was on a Sabbath that Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law; in xiii. 34 f., xxi. 45 f. a concluding observation is adopted from Mark, which loses its significance in our Gospel because other parables follow.

were only indicated are expressly formulated by him; answers to questions introducing a saying of Jesus are more exactly defined; the whole representation appears to be smoothed and simplified. Nowhere does this revision of his text strike us more forcibly than in the history of the passion, which in Mark is undoubtedly original throughout.[2]

[2] The wilderness in which the Baptist appeared, is more exactly defined as the wilderness of Judæa (iii. 1); the way in which the activity of Jesus centres in Capernaum being explained by the statement that He went there to settle (iv. 13, comp. ix. 1). John is immediately on this first appearance called ὁ βαπτιστής (iii. 1), Simon by his surname of Peter (iv. 18), Levi by his Apostolic name Matthew (ix. 9), the high priest, Caiaphas (xxvi. 3, 57); Herod is described by his more exact title of Tetrarch (xiv. 1), Salome as the mother of Zebedee's children (xxvii. 56), the rich man as a youth (xix. 20), Pilate by his full name and as ἡγεμών (xxvii. 2). There is a more exact description in viii. 15 of Jesus' manner of healing, in xii. 1 of the object of plucking the ears of corn, as in xxvi. 58 of the following of Peter, in xiv. 24, 26 of the distress and behaviour of the disciples, in xx. 19, xxvi. 28 of the mode of Christ's death and the object of the shedding of His blood, in xxvi. 68, xxvii. 1 of the subject of prophecy and of the counsel of the Sanhedrim, in xvi. 12, xvii. 13 of the meaning of the word leaven and the saying about Elias. In xiv. 21, xv. 38 the number of those fed is exaggerated; in xvi. 1 the Sadducees are added to the Pharisees, in xix. 19 the commandment of love to the decalogue, while in xxvii. 29 the reed as a sceptre is added to the mocking array of Jesus. Even embellishing touches such as the stretching out of the hand (xii. 49, xxvi. 51), the falling down (xvii. 6) and the solemn adjuration (xxvi. 63) are not wanting. All this is the more striking since Mark with his descriptive, explanatory and embellishing manner would certainly not have allowed these touches to escape him. Fully formulated words are found in iii. 2, xvi. 22, xxvi. 27, 50, 52, 54, a saying amplified from the Old Testament in xxi. 43, and questions modified in accordance with their answers in xiii. 10, xvii. 19, xviii. 1, xix. 3, 27, xxiv. 3. Examples of polished description occur in parts of discourses (xiii. 19–23, xv. 16–20, xvii. 10–12), as in narrative-pieces (xiv. 34–36), and manifest interpolations in Mark's text (xiv. 28–31, xvii. 24–27, xxvii. 3–10, xix. 24 f., 52 f., 62–66, xxviii. 2–4). The very beginning of the history of the passion (xxvi. 1–4) is manifestly a paraphrase of Mark xiv. 1. Judas' demand for money and his payment with thirty pieces of silver (xxvi. 15), his direct unmasking (xxvi. 25), the three acts of prayer in Gethsemane and the three denials (xxvi. 42, 44, 72, 74), the governor's proposal that a choice should be made between Barabbas and Jesus (xxvii. 17, 21) are manifestly secondary touches. That the text of the first Gospel in most of its actual narrative-parts is seen throughout

The existence in the first Gospel of such revision is also shown by the way in which so much of Mark's peculiar phraseology has passed over into it.[3]

2. The first Gospel, however, likewise contains a mass of material not found in Mark, mainly indeed discourse-material, but much too extensive to be ascribed to oral transmission. Hence we are naturally led to assume a use of the Apostolic Matthew, whose main object it was to collect such discourse-material (§ 45). This material whose presence here can already be demonstrated is with great prominence inserted in the structure of various passages of the Gospel (chaps. v.–vii.; x.–xiii. 18; xxiii.–xxv.). Moreover that it was already found by the Evangelist in a fixed written form, is shown by the fact that we are still in a position, with the help of Luke's re-arrangement of it in his Gospel, to trace it back to the original form employed by our Evangelist as the basis of his larger discourses, and to discriminate between its original meaning and that which it receives in the context of the Evangelist.

It is already manifest that the Evangelist had the sermon on the mount before him in his source, from the fact that while he evidently conceives the masses of the people to be the auditory (v. 1; vii. 28 f.), it

---

to be a literary revision of Mark's text, as far as the latter is original, has however been proved by Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, 1872, by a minute exegesis of parallels.

[3] The *εὐθύς*, *ἤρξατο* and *πολλά* so peculiar to Mark (§ 45, 1) occur it is true outside the parallels, as also the technical terms *κηρύσσειν*, *εὐαγγέλιον*, *πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα* introduced by him into the historical narrative, and favourite expressions like *ἐπερωτᾶν*, *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, *ἐξουσία* and others. The Evangelist may nevertheless have appropriated these from him. It is however only in the parallels that the descriptive participles *ἀναστάς*, *ἀναβλέψας*, *ἐμβλέψας* so characteristic of Mark, appear, as also the abundant use of *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*, the expressions *εἰσπορεύεσθαι* and *παραπορεύεσθαι*, *ἐκπλήττεσθαι*, *ἐπιτιμᾶν*, *θεωρεῖν*, *διαλογίζεσθαι*, *ξηραίνειν*, that are comparatively frequent in Mark besides the words *διωγμός*, *σινδών*, *σταχύς*, *κοπάζειν*, *μέλει σοι*, *στρώννυμι*, *τολμᾶν*, *περισσῶς* and the Latinisms *πραιτώριον*, and *φραγελλοῦν*. For further details compare Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, Einleitung, § 2.

is clear from v. 2 that in the source it was addressed to the μαθηταί. But if with the help of Luke's redaction we remove the interpolations of the Evangelist (§ 45, 1), whose original connection Luke still retains, we have a discourse which by its closeness of connection and the allusions to the history of the time perceptible throughout, shows itself to be the original form of it, and such as the oldest source alone could have presented. In the same way the missionary discourse, when the historically impossible interpolation x. 17–39 is removed, resolves itself into a source-discourse whose essential state is attested by Luke x.; the Evangelist having merely introduced a piece independently for reasons connected with his composition (xi. 21–24 = Luke x. 13–15).[1] The way in which the parable is followed by three other parables (v. 44–48) notwithstanding the conclusion borrowed from Mark xiii. 34 f., makes it highly probable that the Evangelist found this already in connection with what is before adduced. (Comp. the similar case xxii. 1–14, where moreover the second part of the parable does not by any means suit the connection there given to it by the Evangelist), even though the two allegories in xiii. 31–33 according to Luke xiii. 19–21 certainly do not belong to this series. That a long discourse from the source is in xviii. 6–35 attached to a piece taken from Mark, is shown by the fragments of it that are preserved in Luke xvii. 1–4, as also by the circumstance that the sayings in xviii. 8 f. already interwoven by the Evangelist in the sermon on the mount (v. 29 f.), find their true meaning only in this connection; and that the parable in xviii. 12–14 (comp. Luke xv. 4–7), notwithstanding the strange way in which it is attached, still makes its original meaning clearly seen and has retained its original wording. So too the wording of the invocation of woe in chap. xxiii. may be completely restored by a comparison with Luke xi., after separating from it the passage v. 8–12 which is undoubtedly extraneous; while the expansions of the discourse on the second coming are shown from Luke to be constituents of the Apostolic source, in some instances directly (comp. Luke xvii. 26–37; xii. 39–46; xix. 11–27), in others, as the parable of the ten virgins, by their undoubted reminiscences (xii. 35 f.; xiii. 25 ff.); for in the source they had originally no reference, or at least no direct reference to the second coming. The conclusion is proved by the contrast between the form

[1] The construction of xi. 24 also shows in the clearest way that x. 15 was the original place of this section; while xi. 25–30 was also according to Luke x. 21 f. connected in the source with the sending out of the disciples. Between them stands the discourse after the Baptist's message (xi. 2–9) which is undoubtedly drawn from the source. The sayings of the oldest source respecting the Sabbath are in xii. 2–8 interpolated in a narrative of Mark, with which from their substance they are hardly in keeping. The two anti-Pharisaic discourses in xii. 22–45 are still retained in Luke xi. in the same grouping.

retained in xxv. 34–46 and the introduction in v. 31 ff., modified by the Evangelist, to have been borrowed from a written source.[2]

We have, however, obvious proof of this discourse-material having been drawn from a written source, in the duplicate sayings, at one time given by the Evangelist in Mark's connection and with adherence to his form, at another time in quite a different connection and in a modified acceptation; a circumstance which can only be explained on the assumption that the Evangelist looked on the sayings that lay before him in different written forms, as distinct utterances.[3] And since the centurion of Capernaum (viii. 5–13) certainly

[2] To these may be added the Baptist's discourses and the account of the three different temptations in the introduction (iii. 7–12, iv. 3–11), which are certainly in Mark's context interpolated, from another source. But since Mark not only freely applies a number of separate sayings from portions undoubtedly borrowed by our Evangelist from the Apostolic source, or weaves them into his own series of sayings, but also retains fragments of larger discourses (§ 45, 2; 46, 4), therefore such discourse-material as is preserved in Mark, not only in its full extent but even in many cases in an enlarged shape, must be regarded as borrowed from this source, but as pointing by the more original form in which it is retained in our Gospel to a knowledge that it was recorded in an older source. To this category belongs in the first place the original discourse on the second coming itself (chap. xxiv.) the conversations with respect to true relations (xii. 46–50) and regarding the greatest commandment (xxii. 35–40), as also the sayings respecting compensation in xix. 22 f., whose introduction in vers. 28 and conclusion in the parable in xx. 1–16 are respectively attested by Luke xxii. 30 and xiii. 30 as belonging to the source.

[3] Thus the saying with regard to offences (v. 29 f.) is repeated in xviii. 18 in a form modified in accordance with Mark, the saying with regard to divorce (v. 32) being repeated in xix., the saying respecting the bearing of the cross and losing one's life (x. 38) in xvi. 24, the saying with regard to the reception of disciples (x. 40) in xviii. 5, the saying with regard to the sign of the prophet Jonah (xii. 39) in xvi. 4, the saying with regard to miracle-working faith (xvii. 20) in xxi. 21; and conversely xiii. 12 which follows Mark is repeated in xxv. 29 according to the Apostolic source; xix. 30 in xx. 16; xx. 26 in xxiii. 11; even xxiv. 23 in xxiv. 26; xxiv. 42 in xxv. 13. But the most striking repetition of this kind is the series of sayings in x. 17–22, which, evidently because put by Mark into the discourse on the second coming, again recur in it (xxiv. 9–14).

belongs to this source, with its interpolation borrowed from a discourse there contained (Luke xiii. 28; comp. the healing of the demoniac in ix. 32 ff. = Luke xi. 14 f., which formed the introduction to the defensive discourse), it is natural to suppose that those narrative-portions which exhibit a shorter or more original text as compared with Mark's account, also proceed from it. All attempts to regard these narratives, in themselves so harmonious and in spite of their brevity so clear and free from discrepancies, as abridgments of the richly-coloured detailed narratives of Mark, are abortive owing to the fact that the sole actual abbreviation of an account in Mark clearly shows how easily inconsistencies and inequalities of statement thus arise, apart from the circumstance that no valid motive for such abbreviations can be adduced.[4] Here too we have an instance where a narrative manifestly drawn from the written source (ix. 27–31) again recurs in a form that essentially agrees with Mark (xx. 29–34); moreover the Evangelist would hardly have adopted the double feeding unless he had recognised the narrative of his older source in the first account.

[4] In the abbreviation of the story of Herodias (Mark vi. 21–29) in Matt. xiv. 6–12, not only is ὁ βασιλεύς retained in ver. 9, though previously corrected, but guests appear, without allusion having been made to a feast (comp. also the unexplained ἐν μέσῳ), while λυπηθείς manifestly contradicts the statement of the same Gospel in ver. 5. By connecting this chronologically with what follows in Mark, not only has a gross anachronism arisen (comp. No. 1, note 1), but also an account of the return to the east coast which is unexplained either by historical or local relations (xiv. 12 f.). Moreover the story of the Canaanite woman, of which Mark's text is most undoubtedly a secondary one, shows that his text may on occasion be the shorter one; and here the original narrative may still be clearly distinguished from the evangelist's framing, which certainly bears indications of being taken from Mark and is secondary as compared with him (xv. 21, 29). The narrative of the lake-crossing is assignable to the source of the discourses by the saying in viii. 19–22, only intelligible in this connection and manifestly put by Luke into a false one (ix. 57–60), as the healing of the lunatic is by the utterance in xvii. 20, only possible here (comp. Luke xvii. 6; Mark xi. 23). Compare also §§ 45, 3; 46, 4.

3. It is obvious that the Evangelist regards the Apostolic source as his main fountain. Only in this way can it be explained why he should frequently have gone back to the text of the oldest source, even where it can be shown that Mark's text was before him (comp. *ex. gr.* xiii. 24–30), and should thus, notwithstanding his dependence on the latter in these passages, have retained the original in opposition to him. But even where we are able to check what is drawn exclusively from the Apostolic source by comparing it with the revision in the third Gospel, it constantly appears how much more faithfully as compared with Luke he has reproduced the text of it; just as he has worked up Mark's text much more freely than that of the source.[1] It is only in this way that we can explain the going back from Mark's richly coloured detailed narratives to their sketchy form in the Apostolic source. This however by no means implies that with nice critical perception he gave the preference to the primary Apostolic source rather than to the secondary source of the Apostolic disciple. But there are only a few narratives in which the Evangelist has gone back entirely to the oldest text, for example that of the leper, of the palsied man, of the raising of the dead, and of the Canaanite woman; generally speaking he has adopted more or less traits from the representation of Mark, such as appeared to him indispensable or conducive to a right understanding of the narrative; for a critical comparison of the text proves that in such cases the original is preserved in Mark.[2] This is still more plainly seen in the parts of

[1] Only in this way is it possible for the more original sense to appear even where the connection and to some extent the form of the discourse-material have been altered by distortion or fresh combination as in v. 25 f., 29 f.; xii. 5 ff. and in particular xiii. 16 ff. (comp. with Luke x. 23 f.) or in the parables in xviii. 12–14; xxi. 33–43.

[2] Compare the forty days in the history of the temptation in iv. 2, the stilling of the storm in viii. 26, the more exact statement of place in viii. 28, the motive assigned for touching the garment in ix. 21, the looking

discourses which were open to the Evangelist in both sources. Truly it may be doubted whether in a section like xx. 24–28 the Evangelist perceived that the piece of discourse which he copied from Mark was a free rendering of a portion of the Apostolic source (Luke xxii. 24–27; comp. Matt. xxiii. 11). But it is likewise clearly seen, especially in the parables, that the Evangelist did not limit himself to the adoption of Mark's embellishing touches, as in the parable of the workers in the vineyard (comp. xxi. 33 and the entirely allegorical conclusion in xxi. 38–41) and in the parable of the grain of mustard seed (xiii. 31 f.), where we have strange mixture of narrative and description and a confusion of the mustard tree and the mustard plant. In some cases he has directly preferred the more richly coloured form of Mark to that of the source, because it seemed to him to be more lucid and significant (xii. 29; xiii. 3–9). So too in the missionary discourse (x. 9 f.; xi. 14), in the defensive discourse (xii. 25 f., 31), and more especially in the discourse on the second coming, the Evangelist has adopted not only the larger interpolations of Mark (xxiv. 9–14, 23 ff.), but also a series of distinct traits (xxiv. 4, 6, 36).[3] Whereas in the conversation

up at the blessing of the bread in xiv. 19, a series of details in the history of the transfiguration xvii. 1, 2, 4, 8, the expulsion of the devil in the history of the lunatic who was not originally supposed to be possessed in xvii. 18, the introduction to the healing of the blind men in xx. 29, and the concluding saying of Jesus in the story of the anointing in xxvi. 13. In the same way the history of the baptism contained in the Apostolic source has become involved in the strange obscurity which now belongs to it by the intermixture of iii. 16*a* from Mark, the use of which is shown by the introduction in ver. 13.

[3] Only in this way can we explain the fact that in xviii. 6–9 he not only distorts the words of Luke xvii. 1 on account of his adherence to Mark, but afterwards modifies the sayings with regard to the avoiding of offences in accordance with Mark, although he had them here before him in the more original form into which he had already brought them in v. 29; and that although xix. 28; xx. 1–16 show that he fully perceived the portion of the Apostolic source lying at the foundation of Mark x. 29 ff., he not only adopts an essential feature from Mark in ver. 29, but also in ver. 30, although the original form follows immediately in

respecting the greatest commandment (xxii. 24–40) he simply went back to the account of the earlier source, a mixture of texts has arisen in the paragraph respecting the true relatives of Jesus (xii. 46–50), which considerably enhances the difficulty of arriving at a judgment as to the original form. The acceptation familiar to the Evangelist may have influenced even the shape given to different maxims which Mark has put into entirely different places.[4] From this

xx. 16. Conversely in the account of Peter's confession (xvi. 13–20) which substantially agrees with that of Mark, we seem to find reminiscences from the parallel account in the oldest source, from which xvi. 17 ff. necessarily proceeds.

[4] It is these phenomena which the advocates of the primitive-Mark-hypothesis (§ 46, 4) have principally employed in order to tax with artificiality the view that the Apostolic source lies at the basis of many portions of Mark, and that the first Evangelist sometimes goes back to the more original form of them, at another time showing himself dependent on Mark's additions. It has even been declared inconceivable that he should have preferred the secondary to the primary source. But it is obvious that critical considerations such as were entirely foreign to that time, are thus foisted on the Evangelist. Just as he does not hesitate to depart from the material borrowed from the Apostolic source, when by new applications or touches he can make it more lucid, more emphatic, more vivid, or more edifying, so he does not hesitate to accept the same modifications when he finds them in Mark. Hence it is natural to assume the consciousness that a representation of events, accurate and complete in every detail, a transmission of the (Aramæan) sayings of Jesus authentic in every word, did not exist even in the Apostolic source, a consciousness that was still strong in his time and was kept alive by the variations in oral tradition. If he prefers this, he does so in accordance with his literary plan, but not with the principle of historical source-criticism. That the mixing of primary and secondary traits in his text as in that of Mark (§ 46, 4, note 2) presents a problem to criticism which cannot be solved by a simple formula, even the primitive-Mark-hypothesis cannot deny; notwithstanding its attempts to minimize the problem, at one time by denying the manifestly secondary character of narrative portions of Mark, and again by conceiving of discourses as independent, their literary affinity being just as great as the dependence on the second Gospel is apparent. This hypothesis itself has been obliged to assume that the first Evangelist, in sections where he visibly follows the oldest source, suddenly interweaves isolated sayings from Mark (not to speak of the primitive Mark), or *vice versâ*, and even that he intermixes the two texts (§ 45, 2, note 2). Compare also § 48, 2.

treatment of his two sources the fundamental idea of the Evangelist's work is most clearly shown. It was not his aim to enlarge Mark's Gospel by adopting fresh material from another source, however naturally such an idea might be supported by a superficial glance at the way in which such material is distributed in his Gospel, but to expand the old Apostolic source, whose form no longer met the needs of the time, into a history of the life of Jesus which would correspond to these. The means for this were supplied by the historical framework of Mark's Gospel, which he only modified in an immaterial way in the two first parts. But in order to bring into it the rich material of his main source, although it offered no direct point of attachment for much of this, and inasmuch as he did not by his modifications create such points of attachment, he was obliged to combine the scattered groups of sayings and parables in the oldest source into larger discourses.[5] That he did not succeed in turning the whole material of the source to account in this way, is shown by Luke's Gospel; but there is no doubt that he has preserved it most fully and faithfully, and so far his work has justly been regarded as the old Gospel of Matthew although an enlarged edition of it.

4. It is certain that even Mark's Gospel did not suffice for shaping the old Apostolic Gospel into a formal life-history of Jesus; for this purpose it was necessary above all to have a history of the birth and childhood, and to conclude with the appearances of the Risen One. But there is no reason whatever for supposing that in chaps. i., ii. or xxviii. the Evangelist employed other sources besides; the genealogy which is planned entirely with reference to his didactic points of

[5] It was only the discourse connected with the dispute as to precedence that he found it necessary to resolve into its elements, of which he could avail himself where Mark's source offered points of attachment, for Mark's Gospel seemed to present an analogous discourse, to which however Matthew attached the one on offences.

view, is certainly not taken from such. What he here narrates is as unmistakeably drawn from oral tradition, as all the material with which he has enriched the narrative of Mark.[1] To the Evangelist belong undoubtedly the interpretations of the parables of the tares and the draught of fishes (xiii. 36–43, 49 f.), as also the reflections running through his narrative as to the fulfilment of prophecy in the history of Jesus. Throughout these pieces first added by the Evangelist there runs a peculiar phraseology, distinguishable from that of his sources and only appearing in his revision of them, which clearly betrays the hand of the Evangelist.[2]

[1] To this category belong the stories about Peter in chaps. xiv., xvii. and the end of Judas, the dream of Pilate's wife and the washing of his hands, the miraculous signs at the death of Jesus and the narrative of the watch at the grave (chap. xxvii.). Moreover many utterances of Jesus, whose connection in the Apostolic source can no longer be shown, may come from oral tradition, as for example the three beatitudes (v. 7 ff.), the figure of the city on the hill, of the dogs and swine, of the doves and serpents, of the plants not planted by God (v. 14; vii. 6; x. 16; xv. 13); the sayings respecting readiness to be reconciled, the angels of children, the eunuchs of the kingdom of heaven, the praise of infants (v. 23 f.; xviii. 10; xix. 10 ff.; xxi. 14 ff.); the word spoken when Peter struck the blow with his sword (xxvi. 52 f.) and the farewell-words of Jesus (xxviii. 19 f.). What Holtzmann and again Mangold have conjectured as to Jewish-Christian sources peculiar to the first Gospel, is entirely without foundation.

[2] Compare the monotonous *τότε* in the narrative, the absolute *λέγων* and *ἀποκριθείς*, the *προσέρχεσθαι* (*προσελθών*) and *ἀναχωρεῖν*, *ἄγγελος κυρίου*, *ἡ ἁγία πόλις*, the plural *οἱ ὄχλοι* (*πολλοί*), *κατ' ὄναρ*, *μέχρι* (*ἕως*) *τῆς σήμερον*, *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*, *ποιεῖν ὡς*, *συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν*, *τί σοι* (*ὑμῖν*) *δοκεῖ* and the standing formula in the pragmatic references. Note the intrusion of Apostolic doctrine in the technical terms *παρουσία*, *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*, *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος-μέλλων*, *ὁ πονηρός* of the devil, *ὁ κόσμος* and *ἡ γῆ* of the ungodly human world, *ἀνομία* and suchlike. Peculiar to the Evangelist, in distinction from his sources we have *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ πρεσβύτεροι τ. λαοῦ* instead of the three-membered expression of Mark, *Ἱεροσόλυμα* instead of the *Ἱερουσαλήμ* of the source (xxiii. 37), *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* instead of *τ. θεοῦ* (comp. the *βασιλεία* of Christ, xiii. 41; xvi. 28; xx. 21, the *υἱοὶ τ. βασιλείας*, the *εὐαγγέλιον τ. βασ.*), *ὁ θεὸς ὁ ζῶν*, *ὁ πατὴρ οὐράνιος* (instead of *ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς*), *ἀπό* instead of *ἐκ*. For further details compare Weiss, *Matthäusevangelium*, Einleitung, § 4, where it is likewise shown that the Evangelist employs numerous expressions differently from the Apostolic

His use of written sources is also shown by the fact that sayings which he has already freely quoted from memory are again brought forward in the connection in which he found them in one of his sources (comp. ix. 13 with xii. 7; xvi. 19 with xviii. 18, and similarly compare x. 15 with xi. 24), or conversely (comp. iii. 7 with xxiii. 33, iii. 14 with vii. 19; v. 34 with xxiii. 22.) This too is the only explanation of the circumstance that the casting out of the devil (ix. 32 ff.) drawn from the oldest source, practically recurs in xii. 22 ff., where the Evangelist gives the discourse to which it is there attached. But the hand of the reviser appears in a remarkable way in the Old Testament citations. For example, whereas citations from the Old Testament were in the Greek translation of the Apostolic source as well as in Mark universally given in accordance with the LXX., the Evangelist appears as a Jew learned in the Scriptures and familiar with the primitive text of the Old Testament. For while he gives an independent translation of the passage ii. 6, he has a number of citations which he could not possibly have got through the medium of the LXX., and which therefore show that he was at home in the primitive text (ii. 15, 23; viii. 17; xii. 18–21; xxvii. 9 ff.); a circumstance that does not prevent his adhering occasionally more or less closely to the Greek translation with which he was equally familiar (i. 23; ii. 18; iv. 15 f.; xviii. 21; xxi. 5), when its expression suited his purpose. In xiii. 14 f., 35; xxi. 16 he even arrived at his citations through it.

This phenomenon has already been observed by Bleek, de Wette, Ewald and others, but has erroneously been reduced to the precise statement that all context-citations follow the LXX., and all citations occurring in the pragmatic reflections of the author the primitive text; since even in the context-citations there is much that proceeds from the hand of the Evangelist (*ex. gr.* xiii. 14 f.; xxi. 6 and the modifications of his source in accordance with the primitive text xxii. 24, 37) for he too knows

source and from Mark. But the fact that none of these expressions recurs in Mark, clearly shows his independence of our Matthew.

and employs the LXX. Hence this view has justly been disputed by Delitzsch, Ebrard and others. The modifications put forth by Ritschl and Holtzmann rest more especially on the passage Matt. xi. 10, an exceptional case, where an undoubtedly original citation in the discourses of Jesus, deviating from the LXX., seems to follow the primitive text; but since the translation of the LXX. (ἐπιβλέψεται) there destroyed the applicability of the passage, the translator of the Aramæan source was forced to give an independent rendering of it. The same thing occurs in Matt. xxvi. 31 where the Evangelist simply follows Mark (xiv. 27), who here indeed does not employ the primitive text and naturally could not give the prophecy quoted by Jesus in Aramæan, in the form of the LXX. which was not suitable to the case, but only in a more original form better adapted to the purpose. The entire difference of the mode of citation was erroneously disputed by Credner (*Beiträge*, Bd. 2, 1838) who made the Evangelist quote from a text of the LXX. altered in the Messianic passages in accordance with the primitive text or an old Targum, and by Anger (*Ratio qua loci Vet. Ti. in Evang. Matth. laudantur*, Lips., 1861, 62), who held that the Evangelist only departed from the LXX. where it was less or not at all in keeping with the aim of his citation.

5. The genealogy with which the Gospel begins has not only the avowed object of proving that Jesus was the son of Joseph the son of Abraham, but also that He was the son of David, with whom according to the Divine dispensation manifest in the history of His race the time had come for the re-establishment of the throne of David; and at the same time of showing how the way in which Jesus became a son of Joseph through Mary, alone answered to the way in which in this history the race was continued by women who became ancestresses of the Messiah in a manner that was quite extraordinary (i. 1–17). Chap. i. 18–25, however, explains more definitely how Jesus became the legitimate heir of the house of David by the fact that Joseph, though knowing that Mary was divinely pregnant in accordance with prophecy (i. 22 f.), yet took her home, not for the purpose of beginning conjugal life with her, but in order from the first to acknowledge her son as his. The second chapter proceeds to show how homage was paid to this new-born king of the Jews by wise men of the heathen, while the then

king of Israel attempted His life, so that His parents had to fly with Him from the old capital into Egypt, and afterwards to settle down with Him in a corner of Galilee; all which indeed had already been foreshadowed by prophecy (ii. 5 f., 15, 17 f., 23).[1] In the preliminary history (iii. 1–4, 22) the Evangelist borrows the Baptist's discourse, with the baptism and temptation of Jesus, substantially from the Apostolic source; and only the description of the Baptist (iii. 4 ff.), Jesus' appearance in Galilee and the calling of the first disciples (iv. 12, 17–22) from Mark. He himself already makes the Baptist like Jesus announce the nearness of the kingdom of heaven; he makes the Baptist direct his philippic against the two chief parties in the nation who afterwards proved so hostile to Jesus (iii. 2, 7), and by making Jesus settle in Capernaum shows how the prophecy that salvation would proceed from the half-heathen territory of Galilee was thus fulfilled (iv. 13–16). The description of the teaching and healing ministry of Jesus, whose fame spread even to Gentile lands (iv. 23 f.), forms the heading of the *first* leading part; for in the sermon on the mount which it contains and which is expanded into a new legislation for the kingdom of heaven, the Evangelist gives a picture of the teaching activity (chaps. v.–vii.), introducing it with a description of the thronging of the people to Christ taken from Mark iii. 7 f. and concluding (iv. 25; viii. 28 f.) with a pourtrayal of the impression produced by the discourse, drawn from Mark i. 22. Then follows a picture of the healing activity (chaps. viii., ix.),

[1] These chapters so fully express the fundamental idea of the Gospel, and so completely betray the hand of the Evangelist, that offence at the miracles can alone have led earlier critics such as Stroth, Hess and Ammon to pronounce them spurious. That they cannot indeed belong to the Apostolic groundwork of the Gospel, since the author evidently did not even know that the parents of Jesus dwelt originally in Nazareth (ii. 22 f.), was already perceived by Eichhorn and Bertholdt.

most skilfully put together from the two sources.[2] The recurrence in ix. 35 of the general description in iv. 23, but without the remark respecting the universal enthusiasm which Jesus inspired, shows clearly enough that the *second*

[2] Just as in Mark the first picture of the public activity of Jesus centres in his first visit to Capernaum, whither he returns after a lengthened journey (ii. 1), so too this part groups itself round two days in Capernaum (viii. 1–17; ix. 1–34), between which lies an excursion to the east coast (viii. 18–34). Nothing but the fact that the leper and the centurion's son formed the first pieces of narrative in the Apostolic source can have induced the Evangelist to begin with them his tableau of the healing activity of Jesus (viii. 1–13); though he does not fail to characterize the second narrative as a type of the calling of the Gentiles, by interpolating the words of ver. 11 f. Only then does Mark's narrative of what occurred in Simon's house follow, for after Jesus' sermon on the Mount His appearing in the synagogue was without significance, and therefore Mark i. 21–28, of which moreover i. 22, 28 (comp. iv. 24) had already been used, fell away. It was only the circumstance that the description of the numerous cures there given formed the most suitable occasion, which could have induced the Evangelist to insert the evidence that this healing of the sick by Jesus was already foreseen in prophecy (viii. 14–18) in this place, and not at the close of his description of Jesus' healing activity. Since he was no longer able to give Mark's description of the circuit made by Jesus (i. 35–45), only characterized by the healing of the leper which had been already anticipated, we find in its stead the excursion to the east coast drawn from the Apostolic source (viii. 18–34); which at the same time afforded a much more significant example of the expulsion of a devil than the healing of the possessed in Mark which occurred along with the whole synagogue scene. The second visit to Capernaum begins as in Mark with the healing of the palsied man, which he gives in accordance with the older source (ix. 1–8); but since the Apostle's calling was according to Mark (at least as he understands him) immediately connected with it in time, and since he gave a new account of the Apostle's work, as also of the proceedings connected therewith respecting Jesus' association with publicans and the non-fasting of His disciples, he was obliged to give this section (ix. 9–17), otherwise quite foreign to the point of view of this part, in accordance with Mark. And since that which follows in Mark contains no account of healing, he puts the narrative of the raising of Jairus' daughter from the dead (ix. 18–26), which in the oldest source probably follows immediately that of the centurion's son, into the second day in Capernaum; and on account of xi. 5 joins with it the healing of the blind men, taken from the same source (ix. 27–31), and the casting out of the devil probably connected with it there (ix. 32 ff.).

leading part begins. The reason of the missionary-discourse being placed at its head (chap. x.) is that the Evangelist by interpolating the saying respecting the fate of the disciples (x. 17–39) has made it refer to the later mission, thus shaping it into a prediction of the insensibility and hostility which Jesus and His cause would meet with; for which reason also the Evangelist says nothing of a present setting out of the disciples. And this prediction is at once fulfilled when even the Baptist is at a loss what to make of Jesus, as his message shows; while in the discourse which follows Jesus discloses the reason why the people are offended in Him (xi. 2–19). In a portion of the missionary discourse, and that to the returning disciples, the Evangelist then shows how Jesus pronounced judgment on the impenitent nation, on the self-righteous, and such of the people as prided themselves on their wisdom (xi. 20–30). This naturally leads him back to the place where he left Mark, because the conflicts with the Pharisees follow there; and he makes use of a description of Jesus' ministry among the people for the purpose of showing by one of its features (singularly conceived indeed) how even Jesus' conduct to His opponents had been foreseen in Old Testament prophecy, and moreover in a passage of Isaiah where repeated allusion is made to His agency among the Gentiles (xii. 1–21). Adhering to Mark he then gives the entire discourse of Jesus against his calumniators in accordance with the source, in harmony with which he connects it with the discourse against those who demanded a sign (xii. 22–45); then returning to Mark he gives the parable discourse which bears witness to the insensibility of the people, as also the rejection of Jesus in Nazareth (chap. xiii.), concluding with the part containing the narrative of the Baptist's death (xiv. 1–12), which like the introduction points prophetically to the fate of Jesus.[3] Henceforward the Evangelist follows

[3] Whereas the discourse against the calumniators is given in full, the

Mark exclusively, and we can only conjecture that he regards the *third* part as continuing from xiv. 13 to xx. 16; for even with him xix. 1 does not form a section of essential importance. In order to show that the benefit accorded to the Canaanite woman should in no wise interfere with the salvation destined for Israel, he has substituted for the healing of a deaf-mute in Mark the description of a comprehensive healing activity on the part of Jesus (xv. 29–31), which at the same time forms a most suitable transition to the second feeding (comp. xiv. 14). He has sharpened the antithesis between Peter's confession and the demand of a sign by the Pharisees and Sadducees (xvi. 1, comp. iii. 7) who with their false doctrine (xvi. 12) lead away the people from faith in Jesus; whereupon the healing of the blind man in Mark viii. was allowed to drop. By adopting the promise to Peter from the source he has then made Jesus foresee the founding of God's kingdom by Peter, who plays the chief part even in the pieces inserted from independent tradition (xiv. 28–31; xvii. 24–27); and now by interpolating extensive discourse-material from the Apostolic

conclusion is evidently wanting in the one against those who asked for a sign (Luke xi. 33–36), because the sayings of which it is composed are already turned to account in the sermon on the mount. The fact that the piece regarding true relatives (xii. 46–50) is here inserted, though it by no means suits the point of view of this part, is only explained on the assumption that the Evangelist read it in Mark and probably also in the Apostolic source, after the first discourse; and put it after the second one only in order not to separate the two discourses, which were so closely connected in substance. In the parable-discourse he himself has given greater prominence to the point of view under which it comes into consideration, by interpolating the prophecy from Isaiah in full (xiii. 14 f.), and has completed Mark's parable-trilogy up to the number of seven in accordance with the Apostolic source. The apparent omission of Mark iv. 35–v. 43; vi. 7–13 explains itself, for he had already given these narratives of healing as well as the missionary-discourse. On the other hand the introduction of the narrative of the Baptist's death (xiv. 1 f.), so foreign to the point of view of the section, can be explained solely by Mark vi. 14 ff., to which this narrative was attached there only by way of appendix.

source (xviii. 1–35, where Mark ix. 37 f. is perceptibly displaced by it, and xix. 27–xx. 16) the Evangelist has developed the instruction of the disciples in Mark into a continuous legislation for the kingdom of God (comp. also xix. 11 f.). The *fourth* part only begins in xx. 17 with the setting out for Jerusalem and an explanation of its object. In the account of the entry into Jerusalem the fulfilment of prophecy is repeatedly shown (xxi. 4 f., 16); the first conflict with the hierarchs is immediately exaggerated, while in an emphatic climax Jesus proclaims their guilt and punishment in three parables instead of in one (xxi. 28–xxii. 14); then again it is the Pharisees and Sadducees who alternately try to tempt Jesus and who finally send a lawyer against Him, after disposing of whom Jesus Himself takes the initiative, and having reduced them to embarrassed silence, concludes with the terrible philippic in chap. xxiii. Thus the loosely-connected scenes in Mark have become *one* scene of combat carried to a dramatic point, making it necessary of course to omit the anecdote in Mark xii. 41–44, which only disturbs the context. The part concludes with the discourse on the second coming (chaps. xxiv., xxv.) extended by a quantity of analogous material and leading up to the final consummation of the kingdom of God (xxv. 34). In the *fifth* part (chaps. xxvi., xxvii.) the history of the passion again contains some direct and indirect allusions to the fulfilment of prophecy (xxvi. 54; xxvii. 34, 43); above all in the narrative of the end of Judas (xxvii. 3–10). The people instigated by the chief priests, here make the choice suggested by Pilate between Barabbas and Jesus still more directly than in Mark; and when Pilate, warned even by his wife, washes his hands in innocence, they go as far as to call down the vengeance of God upon themselves (xxvii. 19–25). The last addition (xxvii. 65–66) prepares the way for the *concluding chapter*, which goes beyond Mark's description of the visit of the women to the open grave, not only by

making Christ appear to the women (xxviii. 9 f.), but more especially by the narrative of the way in which the chief priests employed the watch at the grave (comp. xxviii. 4), in order to paralyze the influence of the resurrection-fact by this last monstrous deception (xxviii. 11–15). Finally Christ exalted to Divine glory appears on the mount of Galilee, where He had proclaimed the fundamental laws of the kingdom of God, for the purpose of sending His disciples forth to all nations with the commission to make them His disciples by baptism and to teach them to observe His commandments, with a promise of His abiding gracious presence (xxviii. 16–20).[4]

6. The fact that the first Gospel bears a Jewish-Christian character can never be mistaken, owing to the emphasis with which it points out Jesus' descent from the house of David and the fulfilment of prophecy in His life. Hereby, however, little is said with regard to the fundamental ideas of the Gospel.[1] It is true chap. i. shows how it was divinely

[4] Attempts to discover the arrangement of the first Gospel (comp. Pelt, *Theol. Mitarbeiten*, 1838, 1; Harless, *De comp. Evang. Matthæi*, Erlang., 1842; Delitzsch, *Neue Untersuchungen über Entstehung und Anlage des ersten kan. Evangeliums*, Leipz., 1853, who regards it as a counterpart of the five books of Moses; Hofmann, *Zeitschr. f. Protest. u. Kirche*, Bd. 31, 1856; Luthardt, *De comp. Evang. Matth.*, Leipz., 1861), which do not take into account the relations of its sources, must inevitably remain unfruitful and lead to arbitrary assumptions.

[1] Even the Tübingen school could not support the view that it represented an anti-Pauline Jewish-Christianity, and that the history of Jesus received its stamp in this interest, since beside such features as could be interpreted in a legal and particularistic, or even anti-Pauline sense (v. 17 ff.; xvi. 27; xix. 17 ff.; xxiii. 2 f.; xxiv. 20 f.; vii. 6; x. 5 f., 23; xv. 24; xix. 28), just as many might be placed which manifestly express the contrary (v. 20–48; vii. 12; xv. 11–20; xxii. 40; xxviii. 20–viii. 11 ff.; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 13; xxviii. 19). Some indeed have resorted to the view of a universalistic revision of an older Gospel-writing which gave clear and undisguised expression to the contrast; and Hilgenfeld's attempt to separate this revision from the Judaistic writing at its foundation is not wanting in acuteness; but it still remains very improbable that the alleged antithesis of the Apostolic age should have been mediated; critics bringing forward contradictory utterances and ideas which

ordained that the son of Mary should have all the rights of that son of David who in the fulness of time was to re-establish the throne of His fathers; but chap. ii. in the history of the childhood immediately shows how the heathen come to worship the child Jesus, whereas the king of Israel persecuted the new-born king of the Jews and ultimately compelled Him to leave the ancient capital and settle in a corner of Galilee. It is true the Baptist proclaims the nearness of the kingdom; but already he is forced to announce to the ruling parties of the nation the judgment of the coming Messiah (iii. 2, 7 ff.). Jesus indeed comes preaching the kingdom; but by settling in Capernaum He shows that salvation is to go forth to the Gentiles (iv. 15 f., 17, 24). He proclaims the inviolability of the law; but teaches an understanding and fulfilment of it at variance with that of the scribes and Pharisees (chap. v.). Immediately after His second miracle of healing He points prophetically to the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles (viii. 11 f.). By the choice of twelve Apostles He nevertheless points to their being destined for Israel, and in His missionary discourse declares in the most definite way that their mission was originally intended for Israel exclusively (x. 2, 5 f., 23), although He can only hold out to them a prospect of the severest persecutions on the part of this nation (x. 17–39). Just as the prophet of God is in danger of being mistaken in Him, so the people are only moved by His preaching to press violently into the kingdom of God, mistaking the wisdom of God in the appearing of the Baptist as in that of the Messiah; the cities in which He did most of His miracles remain impenitent, while Jesus by God's decree may not reveal His saving counsel to the wise of the nation, but must conceal it from

are close together and unmediated. As a matter of fact our Gospel itself offers the simplest mediation of these supposed contradictions.

them (chap. xi.). The Pharisees harden themselves to deadly enmity against Him, and in calumniating Him blaspheme the Holy Ghost; the discourse following the demand for a sign shows how, after apparent improvement through the instrumentality of the Baptist, matters seem to have gone worse with the nation than before (chap. xii.); and the parable-discourse how the judgment of obduracy foretold by Isaiah had already come upon them (xiii. 14 f.). Yet again the Evangelist shows how Jesus, true to His calling, did not yet enter heathen territory but only accords a benefit to the heathen woman while maintaining all the prerogatives of Israel by word and deed (xv. 21–31). Just as in xv. 13 f. he sets forth that the Pharisees by their additions to the law lead the people to destruction, so in xvi. 12 he shows how they along with the Sadducees seduce the people with their false doctrine. It is now no longer possible for Jesus to establish the kingdom of God in the nation, but only to charge Peter with gathering the Church of the Messiah, in which the kingdom of God would be realized under his guidance (xvi. 18 f.). The judgment of the returning Son of man can now no longer be regulated by the law, but by a right attitude towards the Messiah (xvi. 24–27). In the last conflicts at Jerusalem it becomes more and more evident that the kingdom of God must be taken from Israel and given to the heathen (xxi. 43); the account concludes with the great denunciatory discourse which indeed still defends the true claim of the scribes and Pharisees in so far as they only profess to be successors of Moses (xxiii. 2 f.), but to them as the seducers of the people announces judgment, with the beginning of which Jehovah withdraws His gracious presence from Jerusalem (xxiii. 23), and the temple becomes a ruin (xxiv. 2). In the history of the passion and resurrection special emphasis is attached to the circumstance that the people led astray by their guides call down the blood of Jesus upon themselves (xxvii. 20–25), and in con-

clusion to the fact that the seducers of the people do not hesitate to stoop to the lowest intrigue in order to stifle in its birth a belief in the resurrection (xxviii. 13 ff.). When therefore in the concluding scene, Jesus, who is exalted to the throne of all worlds instead of to the throne of His fathers, no longer sends His disciples to Israel but to the Gentiles, teaching them no more to make circumcision and the law obligatory, but baptism and the keeping of His commands, and promises His abiding gracious presence to the community of disciples in whom the former promise that Jehovah would dwell among His people is fulfilled (xxviii. 19), we now know how this issue, so contrary to all the hopes of Israel, has come about. The Gospel is not written for the purpose of taking part in current disputed questions, but is meant to explain how the sending of the Messiah who was destined to be the king of Israel and called to re-establish the Messianic kingdom in Israel, fulfilling its law and promise, had nevertheless led to the gathering of a Messianic Church essentially composed of Gentiles, living solely in accordance with the commands of their exalted Lord and yet appearing as heirs of the prerogative of Israel. It is a question calculated to move deeply the heart of every believer of the Jews who tries to answer it.[2]

7. The customary view, that the author of the Gospel was a Palestinian, is manifestly incorrect, for Palestine is to him only ἡ γῆ ἐκείνη (ix. 26, 31). He is undoubtedly a Jew learned in the Scriptures, reading the Old Testament in the original text (No. 4); Jerusalem is unquestionably in his view the holy city (iv. 5; xxvii. 53); but the native soil of Palestine has already become strange to the Jew of the Dispersion.[1] A Palestinian whose aim it was to expand the

[2] Against a strange interpretation of the Gospel as intended for a reply to official lies contained in a circular writing of the Sanhedrim (Aberle, *Tübinger theol. Quartalschrift*, 1849, 4), comp. Hilgenfeld, (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1864, 4)

[1] An author who makes John, baptizing in the Jordan, appear in the

oldest Apostolic writing into a complete history of the life of Jesus, would not in Palestine, where many eyewitnesses of His life must still have been present, have been able to adhere exclusively to the writing of one who was not an eyewitness, whose account he has in many instances arranged in a way historically impossible (Nos. 1, 3); nor could he have contented himself with adding nothing more from an independent source than a small number of traditional matters which to say the least bear evident traces that they were not had at first hand (comp. also his ignorance of the original dwelling of the parents of Jesus, ii. 22 f.). Many indeed have inferred from xix. 1, without reason, that he wrote in the district east of Jordan; but it is clear that his readers like himself were Jews of the Diaspora, from the fact that he is obliged to interpret the names Immanuel and Golgotha for them, as also the words of the psalm used as a prayer by Jesus on the cross (i. 23; xxvii. 33, 46).[2] Above all the polemic against Gentile-christian libertinism, which the author repeatedly brings

wilderness of Judah (iii. 1, 6), who seems to take the city on the East coast mentioned in his source viii. 33 f. for Gadara (viii. 28), who hardly knows that the Arimathæa taken from Mark (xxvii. 57) is the very Rama he has mentioned before (ii. 18), who makes Pharisees and Sadducees together come to the Baptist and to Jesus (iii. 7; xvi. 1) and Jesus "depart" to Galilee or to the east coast of the lake of Gennesareth in consequence of the intelligence of the Baptist's fate (iv. 12; xiv. 13; comp. also xii. 15), has hardly a proximate idea of Palestinian localities and relations.

[2] Certainly the signification of the name of Jesus common in all places among the Jews (i. 21) was known to the readers; it is not necessary for him to explain to his readers, as in Mark vii. 3 f., the purification-customs practised throughout the Diaspora, nor yet the customs of the Passover no doubt known to every one by a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (comp. xxvi. 17 with Mark xiv. 12; xxvii. 57 with xv. 42; comp. also xxii. 23 with Mark xii. 18); but a custom such as the annual Easter amnesty does not appear to be known to them (xxvii. 15), while localities like Nazareth and Capernaum, Gethsemane and Golgotha are adduced in a way that does not show an acquaintance with them on the part of the readers (ii. 23; iv. 13; xxvi. 36; xxvii. 33).

into sayings of Jesus (vii. 22 f., xiii. 41; xxiv. 12), shows that the Jewish-Christian readers for whom the Gospel was intended in the first place, lived surrounded by Gentile-Christians; and these indications point to Asia Minor where we have seen this libertinism make its most threatening manifestation in the later time of the Apostolic period (§ 35, 1; 38, 2; 41, 1). Herewith the question as to the original language of our Gospel is likewise definitively settled, which language obviously can only have been the ordinary Greek used by the author as well as by his readers.

The question as to the primitive language of our Gospel has been ventilated from early times in the criticism of the Gospels. Since the Church-Fathers ascribed it to the Apostle Matthew, though affirming that he wrote in Hebrew (*i.e.* Aramæan), it seems as if it must in some way be the translation of a Hebrew original (comp. Hieron., *De Vir. Ill.*, 3); but Erasmus and Calvin doubted this opinion. When Catholics appealed on behalf of the authority of the Vulgate to the fact that even our Gospel of Matthew was only a translation, Protestant polemic rejected the view that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, on purely dogmatic grounds, though the hypothesis was not quite without unprejudiced advocates even in the Protestant Church. The question was first discussed in a more scientific way between J. D. Michaelis and G. Marsh (*Abhandlung von der Grundsprache des Evangelium Matthäi*, Halle, 1755), the former of whom was more and more decided in favour of its Hebrew origin; but after Eichhorn's criticism had shown how hazardous this view was with respect to the credibility of the first Gospel, expositors declared almost universally in favour of a Greek original, not only Hug and Schott, but also Paulus and Fritzsche. Guericke and Olshausen alone made the Apostle simply translate himself. But just as de Wette had so early as 1826 thrown equal doubt on the tradition of the Hebrew original of our Gospel and on its Apostolic origin, so in 1832 Sieffert proved unanswerably that we cannot adhere to the tradition of a Gospel-writing by Mark unless at the same time we assume that the Apostle wrote in Hebrew; but that a Greek original of our first Gospel is not thereby excluded if we suppose that the Aramæan Matthew in question was only a source. Most later critics take this path, though many like Bleek and Hilgenfeld still reject the tradition of an Aramæan Matthew (comp. § 45, 4, note 3), but without defending the apostolicity of the Greek like Harless, Anger and Keil, or compromising the matter by holding our Gospel to be a translation,

either of the Hebrew Matthew itself (comp. Thiersch and L. Schulze), or of a Hebrew enlargement of it (comp. Meyer and Delitzsch). The mistakes of translation professedly found by earlier criticism having long been recognised as pure fiction, while it has been adequately shown that the going back of citations to the original text presupposes an author versed in the Scriptures but not a Hebrew original, nothing more can be said in favour of a translation. The explanations of separate Aramæan words, certain plays upon words (such as vi. 16; xxi. 41; xxiv. 7), or genuine Greek constructions (such as βαττολογεῖν and πολυλογία, vi. 7) might certainly have been introduced with some freedom on the part of the translator; but the citations which the author could only have got from the LXX. (No. 4), the linguistic dependence on the Greek Gospel of Mark (No. 1) and the fact that it was designed for Greek-speaking Jews, are decisive for the Greek original of our Gospel.

The attempt to prove from the sayings of Jesus in our Gospel that it presupposed the existence of the Jewish state and the temple worship is vain, since this is only an argument for the genuineness of such utterances. Nor does it follow from the fact that the prophecy in xxiv. 29 is preserved in its most original form that the Gospel was written before the catastrophe of the year 70 (comp. also Beyschlag, Mangold), since it was possible to hope for an immediate ushering in of the second coming soon after this event. On the other hand xxiv. 9 already points to a great persecution of the Christians, xxiii. 35 probably to the murder of Baruch at the conquest of Gamala; xxiv. 30 to an acquaintance with the Apocalypse; while the allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem inserted in xxii. 7 is quite decisive (comp. Weizsäcker). Passages such as xvi. 28; x. 23 show however that it must have been written very soon after this event.[1] In any case the Evangelist has already given up

[1] Even Hilgenfeld and Köstlin refuse to go beyond the first ten years after the destruction of Jerusalem; whereas Volkmar, who found Luke used in our Gospel, put it in 110; and Baur who made Matt. xxiv. refer to events under Hadrian went still farther into the second century. The old Apostolic writing of the year 67 and Mark's Gospel of the year 69 might have been known to the author who lived in Asia Minor, soon after the year 70. Earlier determinations of time rest for

all hope of a completion of the kingdom of God in forms of the national theocracy and only now expects its heavenly completion, for which reason he coins the expression ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. To strengthen the faith of his fellow-countrymen who in face of the destruction of the national hopes of Israel were sorely troubled and had gone astray in their belief, and to show them how it happened that the Messiah who came to fulfil the law and the prophets did not in fact fulfil these hopes (comp. No. 6), *this* is the historical and deeply religious tendency of our Gospel.

§ 48. The Gospel of Luke.

1. Apart from greater and smaller omissions the causes of some of which are still quite transparent, the third Gospel has adopted the entire substance of the second in a still more complete way than the first; even in the rare instances where a narrative piece of Mark is visibly replaced by the parallel account of another source (as in the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth or Peter's draught of fishes), we always find features of Mark's representation interwoven (comp. iv. 22, 24; v. 10 f.); and notwithstanding the apparent freedom by which the history of the passion is frequently characterized, Mark's narrative invariably shows through. Apart from the manifestly intentional precedence given to the synagogue scene at Nazareth, which has led to the transposition of the disciples' calling and the borrowing of both parts from another source (comp. also the transposition of the piece viii. 19 ff., which is equally self-explanatory, and is likewise given in accordance with another source), the Evangelist follows Mark's sequence still more exclusively than is done by the first Gospel, foreign to his literary manner as is its grouping,

the most part on the identification of our first Gospel with the Apostolic writing of Matthew, and are therefore without value.

which for the most part is broken up by the fresh material he adds to it, and is moreover evidently no longer recognised by him as such. The literary, reflective, explanatory and expansive elaboration of Mark's text appears even more strongly throughout the third Gospel than the first; details only mentioned in Mark where they have importance for the narrative, are here anticipated in order to make the implied course of events clear from the beginning; or conversely, details here omitted or modified are presupposed in the subsequent narrative as in Mark.[1] So familiar is Mark's narrative to the Evangelist, that he not unfrequently makes use of it to embellish accounts drawn from other sources. Thus the remonstrance in vii. 6 comes from Mark v. 39, and the words with which Jesus raises up the young man at Nain (vii. 14), from Mark v. 41; the conclusion

[1] The comparison of the text in Weiss, *Marcusevangelium*, 1872, furnishes proof of this throughout, and every paragraph selected affords the most numerous examples of it. Compare in the first connected paragraph taken from Mark, the literary elaboration in iv. 32, 36, 37, the explanatory πόλις τ. Γαλιλαίας in iv. 31, ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθ. in iv. 33, ἐν ἐξουσ. καὶ δυνάμει in iv. 36, συνεχομένη πυρ. μεγάλῳ in iv. 38, γενομένης ἡμέρας in iv. 42, and the paraphrase of κηρύξω in iv. 43; the more exactly defining ῥῖψαν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ μέσον in iv. 36, ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τ. συναγ. in iv. 38, ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν. for λεγ. αὐτ. in iv. 38, the threatening of fever and the παραχρῆμα ἀναστᾶσα in iv. 39, the healing mediated by the laying on of hands in iv. 40, the reflective μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν in iv. 35, the πάντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας in iv. 40, the κραυγάζοντα καὶ λέγοντα etc. (comp. the τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι) in iv. 41, the ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην in iv. 43, the φωνῇ μεγάλῃ in iv. 33 anticipated from Mark i. 26, and the statement in iv. 42 anticipated from Mark i. 37. Similarly we find in v. 17 the anticipatory remark that Pharisees and doctors of the law were present, in viii. 23 that Jesus slept, in viii. 27 that the demoniac wore no clothing, in viii. 42 the age of the maid, in viii. 51 the presence of the parents, and in ix. 14 the number of those who were fed and such like. Conversely we have in v. 19 the presupposition that Jesus was in the house and was thronged by the multitude, taken solely from Mark, in v. 22 Jesus in accordance with Mark guesses their thoughts, although Luke makes them express these openly; in viii. 13 a feature of the parable is interpreted as in Mark, which is wanting in the parable itself because it proceeds from another source (viii. 6).

of the story of the anointing (vii. 50) from Mark v. 34; the ἀνὰ δύο on the sending out of the seventy (x. 1) from Mark vi. 7; Luke xv. 1 from Mark ii. 15; Luke xvii. 14 from Mark i. 44; Luke xix. 28 from Mark x. 32. Hence too the influence of Mark's peculiar phraseology may still be seen in various ways in the third Gospel.[2]

2. The use of a second source in addition to Mark is also clearly visible in the third Gospel in the way in which sayings already adopted from Mark afterwards recur in another connection where the author must have found them in a fixed written form.[1] The most striking instance of such duplicates is found in the missionary discourse taken from Mark in chap. ix., recurring in chap. x. in an altered address. That this discourse was in Luke's source addressed to the Twelve is unanswerably shown by the allusion to x. 4 (xxii. 35) which appears in a speech to the Twelve. It not unfrequently happens elsewhere, however, that series of sayings or parables still clearly betray

[2] The εὐθύς so frequent in Mark is in Luke generally replaced by παραχρῆμα, and is only retained in v. 13; the ὑπάγειν elsewhere avoided occurs in xix. 30, the εἰς τὸ πέραν in viii. 22, the Ναζαρηνός instead of Ναζωραῖος in iv. 34. Expressions which are comparatively frequent in Mark only recur in isolated cases in the parallels in Luke (περιβλεψάμενος, καθεύδειν, ξηραίνειν, δαιμονίζεσθαι, σπαράσσειν, ἀποκαθιστάνειν, διδαχή, πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτ., σίνδων, σταχύς, κύκλῳ, δυνατός: possibly); while other favourite expressions of Mark, though here and there again used independently by Luke, are borrowed from him (κρατεῖν, συζητεῖν, ἐκπλήττεσθαι, etc.).

[1] All the separate elements of the series and sayings in viii. 6–18 (=Mark iv. 21–25) again recur in xi. 33; xii. 2; xix. 26; as also ix. 23–26 (=Mark viii. 34–38) in xiv. 27; xvii. 33; xii. 9. Conversely Luke xx. 46 (=Mark xii. 38 f.) is already found in xi. 43; Luke xxi. 14 f. (a free rendering of Mark xiii. 11) in a more original form already in xii. 11 f. But Luke also interweaves sayings independently, sayings which he has before him in writing in a different place and connection, and which he adopts (comp. xvii. 31 with xxi. 22; xviii. 14 with xiv. 11). In the same way the Evangelist prefaces the introduction to the discourse against those who demanded a sign (xi. 29) in xi. 16 by another one, a reminiscence of Mark viii. 11.

a sense at variance with the connection to which Luke has transferred them, and therefore can only be taken from another context already fixed in writing.[2] This naturally leads to the oldest Apostolic source, which had mainly in view a collection of discourse-material; and in fact the great mass of such material which the third Gospel has over and above Mark, is again found in the first Gospel, and in those parts of it moreover, which he had to trace back to the Apostolic source (§ 47, 2). Thus for example the Baptist's discourse and the three temptations in the wilderness, the sermon on the Mount and the Baptist's message, the discourse against those who demanded a sign and the invocation of woes, the discourse on the second coming and many smaller series of sayings and parables. Nevertheless the Evangelist cannot have taken this material from our first Gospel, for in many cases the series of sayings there skilfully formed into discourses are given by him in their original unconnectedness and with a statement of the original cause (xi. 1–13; xii. 13–34, 54–59; xiv. 25–35; xvii. 22–37) or in a manifestly original connection (xi. 33 ff.; xiii. 24–29; xxii. 25–50), though sometimes also where he himself assigns no motive whatever (xii. 51 ff.; xiii. 18–21; xvii. 1–4), or one that is palpably false (xii. 2 f.;

[2] By being joined to the saying with regard to leaven (xii. 1) the sense of xii. 2 f. is manifestly perverted, for the continuation of the discourse still shows clearly the original meaning. The sense which the saying respecting blasphemy against the Holy Ghost gets by being connected with xii. 11 f., is certainly not the original one, nor is that of xiii. 30, in its connection with xiii. 28 f.; while the saying in xiii. 34 f. is historically unintelligible by its attachment to xiii. 33. The parables in xiv. 16–24; xv. 4–10; xviii. 2–8; xix. 12–27 still clearly show a sense at variance with their literary insertion in xiv. 15; xv. 1 f.; xviii. 1; xix. 11; even the parables in xiv. 8–14 lose their exact parabolic meaning by their insertion in xiv. 7, 12, the meaning of the first of which is clearly shown from xiv. 11. Compare also the allusion to the parable of the ten virgins in xiii. 25 ff. Even the invocations of woe are transferred to a Pharisaic feast where they could not possibly have been spoken, only because they are attached to the washing of cups and platters.

comp. note 2), therefore where their separation from the beautiful connection they have in the first Gospel would be quite unintelligible.[3] Without doubt Luke has preserved the most original form of the similes of the seed-corn and the grain of mustard seed (viii. 4–8; xiii. 18 f.), to which the first Gospel, following Mark, has given a very different shape; while even elsewhere he sometimes differs from it in keeping the original text (comp. for example xi. 30). In the discourse on the second coming the second of the interpolations adopted from Mark in Matt. xxiv. 23 ff. is at least wanting, while the unusually free treatment of the first (Luke xxi. 12–19) seems to indicate that it did not belong to the original form of the discourse on the second coming known to the Evangelist. He must therefore have taken this discourse-material not from our first Gospel but from the source of it. He has given it a much stronger revision almost throughout, and has therefore preserved less of the original, in both however we frequently find only independent and different elaborations of the original.[4] The same relation exists between the

[3] Matt. iii. 7 and Luke iii. 7 are manifestly distinct attempts to give the Baptist's discourses a definite address by literary combination. It is certain that if the Evangelist had only known the parable of the lost sheep in Matt. xviii. where it refers to God's solicitude for His children, he could not have given it an application so much nearer to the original sense, as he does in chap. xv., or even have given back in Luke x. 23 f.; xii. 58 f. their original sense to those sayings which Matt. xiii. 16 f.; v. 25 f. had diverted from it. Compare the retention of vi. 39 in the sermon on the mount (against Matt. xv. 14), of vii. 29 f. in the Baptist's discourse (against Matt. xxi. 31 f.), of x. 13 ff. in the missionary discourse (against Matt. xi. 21 ff.), of xii. 32 against Matt. vi. 34. In the very rare cases where the third Evangelist has removed sayings from the more original connection preserved in the first Gospel (comp. vi. 40; xvi. 16–18 and xii. 10 which is put out of its original place by the transposition of xi. 24 ff.), the reason is always clearly seen (comp. especially xiii. 34 f. and with it note 2).

[4] The sermon on the mount is certainly not original either in the form of the first or of the third Gospel; just as in the former we have an enlargement of it, so in the latter we have an abridgement, which

first and third Gospels where both employ our Mark. Both have on occasion broken through the order of it, each in a different way; the different way in which they interpret a text that is liable to be misunderstood is shown by the parallels to Mark ii. 15–18; the different way in which they explain a figure, by Matt. xvi. 12 and Luke xii. 1 (comp. with Mark viii. 15); and the different way in which they illustrate an obscure connection, by their revisions of Mark ix. 33–37. Of the characteristic additions in the first Gospel to Mark's text (*e.g.* iv. 13; ix. 9, 13; xii. 5 ff., 11 ff.; xvi. 17 ff.; xvii. 24 ff.; xx. 1–16) Luke is as little aware as of the dramatic point given to the last scenes of conflict in Jerusalem (comp. Luke xx. 45–xxi. 4) and of all its peculiarities in the history of the passion and the resurrection. The preliminary narratives in the two Gospels are directly antagonistic, as also their accounts of the appearances of the Risen One,[5] while Luke has not the slightest trace of those linguistic peculiarities which characterize the hand of the first Evangelist (§ 47, 4, note 2). It is thus established as one of the most indisputable results of Gospel-criticism, that Luke's acquaintance with and use of the Apostolic source of the first Gospel

necessitated formal remouldings. In the very introduction the three beatitudes of the first are brought up to seven, in the third they are strengthened by the parallel invocation of woes. The parables of the talents and of the great feast are in both carried out in an allegorical form, but in a way entirely distinct. It has been exhaustively shown in detail by Weiss, how a comparison of the text leads to the result that the original is preserved sometimes in the first and sometimes in the third Gospel (*Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lucasparallelen*, 1876).

[5] One who was acquainted with Matt. ii. could not possibly have written Luke ii. 39; it could not have occurred to one who was acquainted with a genealogy of Jesus which proved that he was a descendant of David in the royal line, to trace back his descent to an obscure collateral branch (iii. 27–31); nor could one who knew from the first Gospel of an appearance of Jesus in Galilee, have excluded it by xxiv. 49.

is just as certain as his want of acquaintance with this Gospel itself.

However evident this may be as a general result, it cannot be denied that a number of separate phenomena exist which do not appear to fit in with it (comp. Ed. Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* Bonn 1880). Even in the historical portions of the Gospel, such as all three have in common, we find points of agreement between the first and third Gospels, *in opposition to* Mark, which seem to indicate a literary connection between them. In these phenomena the primitive-Mark hypothesis has its most specious support (§ 46, 4), for the simplest explanation of them seems to be that the first and third Gospel only preserved the original text of the narrative-source which had already undergone a revision in our Mark. But apart from the suspicion which must attach to every separation of our Mark from the source of the other two Gospels, the form of expression in the specified deviations of our second Gospel appears in many ways so much the more difficult and so much more in keeping with the peculiarity of the whole Gospel, that it cannot have been introduced by revision (comp. the incomplete *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* in viii. 31; x. 34, the *δίς* in xiv. 30, the *ἔπαισεν* in xiv. 47, the *ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν* in xiv. 72, the *ἐνείλησεν καὶ κατέθηκεν* in xv. 46). The greater number of these phenomena are better explained by far if we assume that the Apostolic source contained a series of narrative-pieces, to the shorter form of which Luke often adhered with the first Gospel and even in opposition to it (comp. *ex.gr.* viii. 19 ff.; ix. 28), as also to the more original expression (comp. Matt. ix. 20 with Luke viii. 44), with short introductions to the larger discourses, of which traces are still preserved both in the first and third Gospels (comp. in the introduction to the Baptist's preaching, the mention of *περίχωρος τ. Ἰορδ.* Matt. iii. 5; Luke iii. 3, the transference of the sermon on the mount *εἰς τὸ ὄρος* Matt. v. 1; Luke vi. 12, 20, the introduction to the missionary discourse Matt. x. 1; Luke ix. 1). Other phenomena remain, however, especially in the history of the passion, which can only be traced to current variations of oral tradition (comp. the parallels to the above cited passages of Mark) or to very old text conformations (comp. § 44, 1) or to the influence of the sources peculiar to Luke. In again admitting an acquaintance with the first Gospel on the part of the third, against the collected criticism that follows Weisse, Simons, Holtzmann, Mangold and Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, 1886) give up all certain point of attachment for the discovery of this source, notwithstanding that they deny its having been extensively used, and trace back the great mass of coincidences to a common source. The Evangelist is accused of the neglect, quite inconceivable in face of his own declaration (i. 3), of a source with which he was acquainted and which had

such importance for him, or even (with Wendt) of a criticism foreign to his whole manner, which besides being untenable and contradictory in itself, is often limited to the fact that he preferred one single expression of the first Evangelist against Mark (or the Apostolic source). Comp. also § 47, 3, note 4.

3. The third Gospel contains a great mass of material which can neither be derived from Mark nor from the Apostolic source, but must yet have lain before the Evangelist in a fixed written form. This is seen in the glaring contrast between the classic Greek of the prologue and the history of the birth beginning in i. 5, so strongly Hebraistic in language and delineation; and also in the way in which Luke has sometimes combined narratives of one source with parallel accounts of others, which evidently do not entirely harmonize with the text before him.[1] It is most probable, however, that this material belonged for the most part to *one* source which embraced the entire life of Jesus, for excepting the preliminary history (chaps. i. ii. with the Baptist's preaching, iii. 10–14 and the genealogy iii. 23–38) it represents all sides of the public life of Jesus commonly illustrated in evangelical tradition. It contained a calling of the disciples (chap. v.), narratives of the intercourse of Jesus with publicans and sinners (comp. the story of Zacchæus in chap. xix. and the anointing by the woman who was a sinner, in chap. vii.), the healing of the centurion's son (chap. vii.), a healing of lepers (the grateful Samaritan, chap. xvii.),

[1] Thus the insertions from Mark in the history of the calling and in the synagogue-scene at Nazareth (20, 1) clearly disturb the flow of the narrative, in the story of the anointing the name of Simon suddenly crops up in vii. 40 (from Mark xiv. 3), although the name of the host is not given, while the account of the healing of the centurion's son taken from the Apostolic source (vii. 6–9) does not quite suit the other account before him (vii. 1–6, 10), and the paragraph with regard to the greatest commandment (x. 25–28) manifestly borrowed from the same source does not quite suit the conversation connected with it respecting the meaning of πλησίον drawn from the source peculiar to him (x. 29–37).

a raising from the dead (chap. vii.), a healing on the Sabbath-day and a legal question (chaps. xiii. x.), the woman who blessed Jesus (xi. 27 f.) and the narrative of Mary and Martha (chap. x). Of parables it certainly contained the prodigal son, the rich man and poor Lazarus, the Pharisee and the publican (chaps. xv., xvi., xviii.), and perhaps also the parable xvii. 7–10. That it likewise included the history of the passion, is more than probable from the fact that a series of pieces, such as the prediction of the betrayal and of the denial, the prayer in Gethsemane and the proceedings before the chief council in it deviate so strongly from Mark; the account of the crucifixion presenting such striking additions (comp. in particular xxiii. 4–16, 27–31, 39–43, 46), that the narrative can only be explained by the fusion of Mark with another source. Finally, to this source certainly belongs the story of the disciples at Emmaus, as shown by its awkward combination with the appearance on Easter Eve, perhaps even (in another order) this itself.[2] Of the origin and character of this source, nothing more definite can be made out than the certainty that, in accordance with its entire mode of presentment, it proceeded from Jewish-Christian circles. It contains a remarkable series of points of contact with traditions which crop up in the fourth Gospel.[3]

[2] How many of those sayings (v. 39; ix. 61 f.; xii. 49 f.; xix. 39 f.; xix. 42 ff.; xxi. 34 ff.) or details (viii. 1–3; ix. 51–56), especially in the history of the crucifixion, which Luke alone has retained, belong to this source and are taken from oral tradition cannot of course be demonstrated.

[3] Compare iv. 29 f. with John viii. 59; the miraculous draught of fishes in chap. v. with John xxi.; vii. 38 with John xii. 3. The stories of the Samaritans in chap. ix. 17 with John iv., of Mary and Martha in chap. x. with John xi. 12, the parable of Lazarus with John xi., in the history of the passion the transference of the prediction of the denial to the last supper, and the denial itself *before* the transaction in the chief council; the proposal of scourging instead of crucifixion Luke xviii. 16 (comp. John xix. 1 ff.) and the appearing on Easter Eve.

4. The Evangelist in his preface expressly classes his work with the attempts of those who have put together a description of the Gospel history from the tradition of eye-witnesses, and declares (i. 1 ff.) that for his part, after having carefully followed everything from the beginning, it is his intention to write it down in the natural order of time. He too therefore had followed as far as he could the tradition of eye-witnesses, and since this was already fixed in writing in the oldest source (the Apostolic Matthew), he must have adhered mainly to it (No. 2). It being essentially, however, only a collection of material, predominantly discourse-material, he was mainly thrown back for a connected narrative of the life of Jesus on the attempts of his predecessors who had tried to compile such a narrative from the written and oral tradition of eye-witnesses. Far as these must have been from satisfying him since he made a fresh attempt, he can have had no intention of blaming them as the Church-Fathers supposed, since he puts his own quite on a par with theirs. It is true he speaks of a number of such attempts, but it is very possible that many of them were known to him only from hearsay and that many contained only separate portions of the life of Jesus or were simply a compilation of a certain kind of material; in any case an analysis of his Gospel points with certainty only to his having employed our Gospel of Mark and probably some attempt of the same kind (Nos. 1, 3). It was, however, by no means his intention to join these sources together like mosaic, but with their help to create a new and independent work. For this reason he has worked them over entirely, and hence it is that in a certain degree a uniform linguistic character runs through the whole work, discernible also in the Acts which are written by the same hand (Acts i. 1). Nevertheless he has by no means composed it in classic Greek, with which, to judge from the beautiful period of the preface (i. 1–4) he was familiar. Through his predecessors the

character of Old Testament history and a Hebraizing expression had been made the type of Gospel-narrative; and unless he had entirely recast his sources or written in an insufferably diversified style, it was necessary for him to accommodate himself to it as far as possible.[1] But in many instances he has even worked over the substance of his sources. He had already accumulated such a wealth of material from them that he was obliged to think of abridging. Analogous narratives in his sources, such as the two accounts of the calling, the two synagogue-scenes in Nazareth, and the two conversations respecting the commandment of love, he blends harmoniously together (comp. No. 3, note 1); duplicates he avoids on principle, even omitting one of two somewhat similar narratives. This must have been the reason why he went back in many cases from the wealth of detail in Mark's narratives to the shorter account of the older source (comp. No. 2); and even elsewhere he has left out a number of smaller details which had lost their meaning or their perspicuity for his readers. The same

[1] Throughout the entire Gospel the practised Greek author is seen in the more abundant use of particles, in the predilection for composita and decomposita, in the frequent use of the optative, and the infinitive with the article, in the neuter adjective or participle with the article, in interrogatories with the article, in the nominative with the article instead of the vocative, in the use of the indefinite τις, in the predilection for the genitive absolute and for attractions. The addressing of Jesus as ἐπιστάτα is peculiar to Him, as also His designation in the narrative as ὁ κύριος, χάρις (χαρίζεσθαι), σωτηρία (σωτήρ), ἐφιστάναι and ἀφιστάναι (σταθείς, ἑστώς), στραφείς, εἰσάγειν, παύεσθαι, εὐφραίνεσθαι, ὑπάρχειν, the middle voice ἰᾶσθαι, μετὰ ταῦτα, and the predilection for the expressions ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, φωνή, ἀνήρ, τόπος, λαός, ἱκανός of a great number, καὶ αὐτός, καλεῖν (to name), μέλλειν, πορεύεσθαι, ἀνίστημι (ἀναστάς), ἄγειν, διέρχεσθαι, ὑποστέφειν, δεῖ, δὲ καί and the like. Everywhere he effaces the expression ὀψία, and θάλασσα for the sea of Galilee, in most cases he replaces εὐθύς by παραχρῆμα, ὑπάγειν by πορεύεσθαι, ἀμήν frequently by ἀληθῶς, and the dative after the verb of saying by πρός with the accusative. On the other hand he has appropriated to his own use the frequent ἰδού of his sources, circumlocutions with γενέσθαι, and the plastic expressions with πρόσωπον, χείρ, καρδία, στόμα, ὦτα, ὀφθαλμοί, etc.

regard for his readers is also shown in the removal of all matter which had lost its meaning for them because of its special reference to internal Jewish relations. For the same reason all that is liable to be misunderstood is left out.[3] Naturally this abridging operation did not prevent the author adding an explanatory or embellishing touch where it seemed necessary to an understanding of the narrative (No. 1, comp. his predilection for the mention of Jesus praying), nor did it interfere with his giving allegorical features to the parables (comp. No. 2, as also 5, 36), or strengthening the discourse with a fresh example (xi. 12; xvii. 28 ff., 32, 34) or a new parallel (vi. 27 f., 32 ff., 37 f. comp. also the adding of the invocation of woes to the beatitudes, vi. 24 ff.). As in Mark's Gospel, so likewise in the

[3] That the Evangelist avoids duplicates on principle, is shown for example by the omission of Mark iv. 23 f., of the second account of the feeding and of the demand for a sign in Mark viii.; where duplicate sayings have remained (No. 2, note 1) he probably has not observed it. The second lake-miracle in Mark vi. is omitted, the second healings of the deaf-mute and the blind in Mark vii. 8, the second account of the anointing in Mark xiv., the dispute as to precedence in Mark x. 35 ff. on account of Luke xxii. 24, the cursing of the fig-tree in Mark xi. 13 f. on account of Luke xiii. 6–9, and Mark xv. 16 ff. on account of Luke xxii. 62 ff., xxiii. 11. The details respecting Levi the toll-gatherer, the blind man at Jericho, Simon the Cyrenian, the names of Zebedees and Herodians have disappeared. For the sake of his Gentile-Christian readers he has omitted the whole interpretation of the law and the anti-Pharisaic polemic from the sermon on the mount, as also the dispute respecting the washing of hands and divorce (Mark vii. 10). Conflict with the Pharisees could not of course be left entirely out of a history of Jesus; but Luke confines himself to the disputes concerning the Sabbath and the invocation of woes, in which also much that would be unintelligible to his readers is either altered or omitted. The sayings respecting forgiveness, Luke xvii. 3 f., are abridged on account of their reference to Jewish circumstances, the mention of pre-Christian righteous men (Matt. x. 41; xiii. 17; xxiii. 29), the τελῶναι and ἐθνικοί (Matt. v. 46 f.) are omitted. The story of the Canaanite woman, sayings such as Matt. x. 5 f. and the second half of the parable of the feast (xxii. 11–14), perhaps also vii. 6 are left out as liable to be misunderstood; so too in another connection is Mark ix. 43–48 (comp. also the recasting of Matt. xii. 28).

third, the discourses of the Apostolic source suffer much stronger revision than in the first; interpretations *ex eventu* (xxi. 24) and instructive applications are inserted with much greater freedom (comp. No. 6). Where he finds discourses whose occasion is not thus specified, he supplies one by literary combination (iii. 7, 15; vii. 21; x. 1; xi. 16; xi. 37 f.; xviii. 1, 9), often by a question or a petition (xiii. 23; xvii. 5), frequently explaining turns of the discourse in that way (xi. 45; xii. 41; xvii. 37). Already the alterations which Luke makes in his texts rest on pragmatic reflections, already later events are carefully anticipated by earlier indications or attached to previous occurrences.[3] Having promised to relate everything in order, the Evangelist concludes the history of the Baptist, iii. 18 ff., before passing on to the history of Jesus, and has attempted to divide His public ministry, purely according to time, into work in Galilee, outside Galilee, and in Jerusalem (comp. No. 5). Finally he has already begun to connect the sacred history, by the notices in ii. 2; iii. 1 ff., with great historical events, and has thus entered on its treatment more as a historiographer.[4]

[3] In vi. 11 he seems to think it too soon for the Pharisees to have designs on the life of Christ; he no longer ventures to attribute the gross popular superstition to Herod (ix. 9), nor does he any longer address the man who was palsied on account of his sinful life, as τέκνον (v. 20). The transposition of the temptations (chap. iv.) likewise rests on pragmatic reflections, as also the pieces xi. 24 ff., 31 ff. In iv. 13 the Evangelist paves the way for the appearing of the devil (xxii. 3), in viii. 2 f. for the appearing of the women (xxiii. 55–xxiv. 10), in ix. 9 for that of Herod in the history of the passion (xxiii. 8); in the same way the δεήσεις ποιοῦνται (v. 33) paves the way for the passage xi. 1, the mention of Bethsaida (ix. 10) for the passage x. 13, the passage xi. 53 ff. for the last struggles in Jerusalem (xx. 20), and xxi. 37 f. the way to Gethsemane. Thus xi. 16; xii. 1 account for the combination of two subsequent discourses taken from his source. Conversely iii. 3 is joined on to i. 80; iv. 1 to iii. 22; v. 12 to iv. 43 etc. On the other hand an historical and critical selection and revision of the material of his sources is only attributed to the Evangelist, as recently by Wendt, on the basis of a misinterpretation at variance with the wording. Comp. No. 2 at the end.

[4] It is vain to try to explain "the literary plan and historiographical

5. After the introduction (i. 1–4) the Gospel begins with announcements of the birth of the Baptist and of Jesus, which are found skilfully interwoven in the section i. 39–56. Then follow the birth and circumcision of the Baptist, and in chap. ii. the birth of Jesus, to which are attached traditions from the history of His infancy and youth. The Baptist's ministry is illustrated solely by the completed citation from Isaiah and by his own discourses, concluding with a notice of his imprisonment (iii. 1–20). Then to a short mention of the baptism of Jesus and His entering upon His ministry a genealogy of Jesus is attached (iii. 21–37) immediately followed by the history of the temptation (iv. 1–13).[1] The *first* leading part of the Gospel contains an account of Jesus' *Galilean* activity (iv. 14–ix. 50), iv. 14–vi. 19 simply following Mark's Gospel, whose order Luke, like the first Evangelist, manifestly regards as chronological.[2]

treatment of Luke" (Nösgen, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1876, 77) if we practically leave his use of sources out of consideration. The view that he arranged his material essentially according to its substance (comp. Ebrard, Hofmann, Keil and others), solely devised in a harmony-seeking interest, is at variance with his express declaration in i. 3 and leads to arbitrary arrangements of the Gospel.

[1] The two introductory chapters are declared by the Eichhorn school of criticism to be spurious, without any foundation whatever, and are assigned by Baur, Scholten and Wittichen to a later revision of it, in the interest of arbitrary conceptions of tendency on Luke's part. It is noteworthy how in the history of the Baptist the description of his appearance (Mark i. 5 f.) falls away, although according to iii. 3, 22; iv. 2, Luke undoubtedly knows Mark's account. Since the entire preliminary history with the genealogy proceeds from the source peculiar to him (No. 3), and the history of the temptation from the Apostolic source (No. 2), he has ranged the material presented by both side by side in the Baptist's discourses.

[2] The sole deviation from him consists in the fact that he gives the rejection of Jesus in Nazareth (iv. 16–30) essentially in accordance with the source peculiar to himself, in whose account it already forms a prediction of His rejection by Israel and of the calling of the Gentiles; and he therefore puts it at the head of his narrative, though clearly indicating that it belongs chronologically to the middle of Jesus' ministry (iv. 15 f., comp. iv. 23). By this means the calling of the disciples is

The fact that he first narrates the choosing of the Apostles and then the thronging of the people to Jesus in distinction from Mark (vi. 12–19) has no material significance; because here, where Jesus is on a mountain and surrounded by the people, he is able to introduce the first large portion of the Apostolic source, viz. the sermon on the mount (vi. 20–49). Along with it he now repeats from this second source all that seemed to him to belong to the earlier time, down to the parable (viii. 4–8); in which way the first great interpolation in Mark's text arises. From it we see therefore, that the healing of the centurion's son (vii. 1–10), the raising from the dead (for which, on account of vii. 22, Luke is obliged to substitute the raising from the dead given in his third source, vii. 11–17, since he desires to reproduce Mark's more detailed account) and the Baptist's message (vii. 18–35), must certainly have stood between these two discourses; for the story of the anointing, with the notice of the ministering women (vii. 36–viii. 3), is merely an illustration of vii. 34, interpolated from the third source. With the parable of the sower, which he explains in accordance with Mark (viii. 9–18), Luke again returns to Mark iv., and only now needs to repeat the anecdote of the relations of Jesus which there immediately precedes the parable-discourse (viii. 19–21); for even in the second Gospel, Mark iii. 22–30 clearly appears as an interpolation, which Luke desires to give in the connection of the older source. He is then able to follow the thread of Mark uninterruptedly, from viii. 22 to ix. 50, where Jesus' Galilean activity ends in this Gospel also.[3]

forced out of its place at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (iv. 15 f., comp. iv. 23). And since Luke gives it also in accordance with the account of another source (v. 1–11) which presupposes an acquaintance with Jesus and His miraculous power on the part of Peter (v. 5), it can only follow the first manifestations of this power, in Capernaum (iv. 31–41); although, it is true, the visit to Simon's house thus loses its explanation that is so natural in Mark.

[3] The scene in the synagogue at Nazareth which was already referred

The *second* leading part (ix. 51–xix. 27) describes the work of Jesus outside Galilee, evidently conceived by Luke as Jesus's going about in parts of the country outside Galilee, Jerusalem being His final aim. That He confined His activity entirely to Samaritan soil has been erroneously inferred from the fact that Luke significantly begins his account with an anecdote showing that Jesus was rejected even in Samaria (ix. 51–56); His rejection in Nazareth having foreshadowed the result of His Galilean activity. The first section of this part is thus the missionary-discourse of the Apostolic source, which Luke finds it necessary to refer to the sending out of a larger circle of disciples (x. 1), since he had already given the sending out of the Twelve in accordance with Mark (chap. ix.), and since x. 2 seemed to point to a number, if only a small one, of co-workers. The passage x. 13 ff. shows clearly that this discourse belongs to a time when Jesus looked upon His Galilean ministry as concluded; hence Luke infers that it, and all that follows in the source, occurs on extra-Galilean soil.[4] Taken from it, therefore, we have now the

to in iv. 22, 24 was necessarily omitted, as also the imprisonment of the Baptist already mentioned in iii. 19, and his beheading already presupposed in ix. 9. Hug tried to explain the omission of Mark vi. 45–viii. 26 by the theory that our Luke is defective, Reuss by assuming that he had a defective copy of Mark; but the absence of the various pieces of this section is explained by the literary tendency of Luke (No. 4, note 2), to which may be added the fact that in this very section Jesus is found on journeys outside Galilee (Mark vii. 24, 31; viii. 10). But the emphatic way in which Luke adheres in this section to the standpoint of Jesus's Galilean activity, is shown by the fact that in the healing of the demoniac on the east coast he emphasizes the circumstance that it took place ἀντιπέρα τ. Γαλιλ. (viii. 26), and that, following Mark vi. 45, he puts the feeding into the neighbourhood of Bethsaida (ix. 10); as also that he leaves out the specification of locality in Peter's confession (ix. 18). That he was acquainted with the section from Mark, is however clear from xii. 1 (comp. Mark viii. 15), not to speak of ix. 10.

[4] In so doing he erroneously presupposes that everything in the Apostolic source is given in chronological order. Since the second great interpolation from this source now begins, the missionary discourse must

discourses on the return of the disciples (x. 17–24), those on prayer (xi. 1–13), the anti-Pharisaic disputes (xi. 14–52), the predictions of the disciples' fate (xii. 1–12), the discourse on care and the accumulation of treasure (xii. 13–34), the parable of the second coming (xii. 35–48), the sayings with regard to the beginning of the crisis and the signs of the time (xii. 51–59), the last exhortation to repentance (xiii. 1–9, 18–35), with the parable of the feast and the discourse on true discipleship (xiv. 15–35), prefaced by the Evangelist with the Sabbath-healing of the Apostolic source and two small parables (xiv. 1–14) probably for the sole reason that they seemed to him from their substance to belong to the same place. With this exception he appears to have followed the thread of the Apostolic source entirely, for it is evidently taken up again in chap. xvii. where we find the remainder of the discourse on offences and of the narrative of the mount of transfiguration (xvii. 1–6, comp. Matt. xviii. 6 f., 21 f.; xvii. 20) as also the discourse on the second coming (xvii. 20–37) which concludes with the par-

in it have followed the parable discourse, where Luke left it. From this it follows with the greatest probability that between these two came the sayings contained in ix. 57–60 which he erroneously puts at Jesus' setting out on His wanderings, but which according to Matthew viii. 19 ff. belonged to the narrative (which he has already given in accordance with Mark) of the expedition to the east coast; so that for this reason also it must have stood in the source and moreover between the above two discourses (comp. § 45, 3, Note 1). Thus we see in the clearest manner how by combining his two sources the Evangelist came to separate the activity of Jesus in Galilee from His work outside Galilee. The earlier idea that this section contains a continuous account of his journeying, as also the view devised in an harmony-seeking interest that different journeys to Jerusalem may there be distinguished, are frustrated by the fact that we find no mention of the stations of such a journey, but on the contrary the explanatory remark in one of the latest pieces that Jesus was on the border between Galilee and Samaria (xvii. 11). As to the rest we are constantly reminded that Jesus was on a journey (x. 38; xiv. 25), on a journey moreover whose final aim was Jerusalem, as we are again told in explanation of what follows (xiii. 22 comp. xiii. 33 f.).

able xviii. 1–8 (comp. § 45, 3). With this material from the Apostolic source is connected a quantity of other material drawn from the source peculiar to Luke, in particular x. 25–42; xiii. 10–17; xv. 1 f., 11–xvi. 31; xvii. 7–19; xviii. 9–14, of which we are no longer able to state whether or how far Luke was led by this source to give them their present chronological position, since all knowledge of the arrangement of the source is wanting.[5] On the other hand it is quite clear that in the second section of this part Luke gives all, with a few easily explained omissions (No. 4, note 2), that in Mark plays a part in Jesus' activity outside Galilee down to the healing of the blind man in Jericho (xviii. 15–43); he only adds the story of Zacchæus, which took place at Jericho, from the source peculiar to himself (xix. 1–10), and the parable of the talents from the Apostolic source, which from his interpretation he expressly regards as having been spoken when approaching Jerusalem (xix. 11–27). The *third* part, in the beginning of which the lament over the obduracy of

[5] This is the only point in Luke's composition which we are no longer able to clear up; but xi. 27 f. is manifestly substituted for the piece formerly given by Luke in viii. 19 ff. but standing in the source between the two anti-Pharisaic discourses, and xii. 49 f. may very well have been inserted as an introduction to what follows. Moreover it is not improbable that in the source peculiar to Luke these pieces were attached either in substance or in time to those pieces whose parallels he had given in the former connection from the Apostolic sources. The narrative of Mary and Martha alone (x. 38–42) might have been devised and arranged by himself as a kind of counterpart to the paragraph respecting the chief commandment (x. 25–37). The main difficulty, however, lies in the fact that as in the latter the conversation regarding the highest commandment from the Apostolic source is connected with a piece of the source peculiar to himself (No. 3, note 1), so parables from the latter (xv. 3–10; xvi. 1–3) are manifestly joined to the parables in xv. 11–32 (comp. xv. 1 f.) and xvi. 19–31 (comp. xvi. 14 f.) from the former, on account of the supposed relationship of subject between them; so that these too are taken from their original place, by which means, as also by the arrangement of xiv. 1–14 according to substance, the thread of the Apostolic source, so easily followed elsewhere, is no longer equally visible.

Jerusalem is directly interwoven (xix. 41–44), gives the *Jerusalem* activity in strict accordance with Mark (xix. 28–xxi. 38), from whom the story of the fig-tree (on account of xiii. 6–9) and the conversation on the greatest commandment (on account of x. 25 ff.) are alone omitted. The conclusion is then formed by the history of the passion (chaps. xxii. xxiii.), which also follows Mark, and is modified and enlarged throughout from his own peculiar source; a piece from the Apostolic source being again inserted in it into the history of the last supper (xxii. 24–30, 35 ff.). Finally in the resurrection-chapter the appearances of the Risen One (xxiv. 12–43) are attached to the scene at the open grave taken from Mark (xxiv. 1–11). The conclusion with the last charges of Jesus to the Apostles and His parting from them (xxiv. 44–53) certainly proceeds from the hand of the Evangelist.

6. Our Gospel is therefore a doctrinal writing, notwithstanding that it has more the character of historiography (No. 4); the author expressly says that he desires by his historical narrative to attest the credibility of the doctrines in which Theophilus had been instructed (i. 4). The assumption that these were the Pauline doctrines is certainly correct. All three leading parts begin very significantly it is true with narratives setting forth the insensibility of Galilee, Samaria and Jerusalem with regard to Christ (comp. No. 5). Already in the synagogue at Nazareth Jesus points to the possibility that God might bestow on the heathen the salvation that was despised by Israel (iv. 25 ff.); a saying uttered by Jesus at the height of His activity is expressly applied to the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of Israel (xiii. 30); in an allegorizing feature of the parable of the feast expression is given to the Pauline idea that the calling of the Gentiles is designed to fill up the gap which has arisen by the falling away of many Israelites (xiv. 22 ff.); and in the end the Apostles are sent to all nations

(xxiv. 47 f.).[1] The Evangelist loves to dwell on the narratives and parables which set forth God's love to sinners and speak of the forgiveness of sin; in the saying in xi. 13 the petition for the Holy Ghost is brought in, who is once more expressly promised in xxiv. 49. The willing hearing of the word as the one thing needful (x. 42) is significantly put over against the exhortation to fulfil the commandment of love (x. 37). The story of the anointing emphasizes the love that is born of faith (vii. 47, 50); that of the publican and the thief, the mercy shown to the repentant sinner (xviii. 14; xxiii. 43); the parable in xvii. 7–10 forbids all seeking of recompense, while the recommendation of prayer runs through the whole Gospel and is specially enforced by the example of Christ. These confirmations of Pauline doctrine have not however a polemic tendency as opposed to other views of doctrine, but have the edifying purpose of strengthening faith in the Pauline sense and of promoting the life of faith.[2] This is evident above all from the fact that

[1] On the other hand the fact of the genealogy being carried back to Adam has certainly been erroneously adduced as evidence of the author's universalism, for he evidently does not perceive its artificial arrangement and has therefore simply adopted it from his own source; ii. 32 also undoubtedly belongs to this source. Nor can we attach any importance to the seventy disciples as a type of Gentile messengers, because the author adopted the sending of them solely from his sources (No. 5), because they were by no means destined for Samaria, and because, owing to the want of a *πάντα*, x. 7 can contain no reference to intercourse with the Gentiles at meals. The assumption of a peculiar friendship towards the Samaritans in the Gospel is excluded by ix. 52 ff.

[2] An anti-Jewish tendency is already out of the question, for the reason that the preliminary history which begins and concludes in the temple at Jerusalem commends the Old Testament piety of the persons who there appear, and sets forth the Messianic hope entirely with the national theocratic stamp. Later too, in the Gospel itself, Jesus is the Son of David (xviii. 38 f.; xx. 41 ff.), the theocratic king (xix. 38); and as it begins with the fulfilment of the *γραφή* (iv. 21), so it concludes with the proof of this fulfilment (xxiv. 44 f.). Likewise in xiii. 16; xix. 9 salvation is destined in the first place for Israel; and in xxii. 30 the Twelve are appointed for the twelve tribes of Israel. Just as little is there any

the most prominent tendency of the Gospel has nothing whatever to do with the antithesis of Paulinism and Jewish Christianity. It consists in the recommendation of benevolence put into various utterances of Jesus (xi. 41; xvi. 9), which is to extend to the total sacrifice of property; the demand of Jesus in a single instance (xviii. 22) being thus made absolute (xii. 33). This manifestly rests on the idea that wealth is pernicious in itself and poverty salutary in itself; an idea already stamped on the beatitudes of the sermon on the mount (vi. 20 ff.) and carried in xvi. 25 so far as to conflict with the obvious sense of the parable. From this it is clear however that the author has hardly apprehended the mind of Paul fully; just as the setting of the sayings in xvii. 10; xviii. 14, if they are meant to reflect Pauline doctrine, does not express them correctly.[3]

The Tübingen school has nevertheless endeavoured to prove the existence of a Pauline tendency in Luke's Gospel, partly by a comparison of its peculiar character with the first Gospel, with which the author has no acquaintance whatever (No. 2); and which in its great concluding scene gives a still more solemn form than it, to Christ's institution of the Gentile mission (Matt. xxviii. 19; comp. also xxiv. 14; xxvi. 13) and to his announcement of judgment upon Israel (xxvii. 25); partly by arbitrarily allegorizing in an anti-Jewish sense, narratives such as that of

---

evidence of an antinomian tendency. Even in the case of the child Jesus all legal prescriptions are fulfilled (ii. 21, 27, 39); in v. 14; xvii. 14 their fulfilment is enforced; and in xxiii. 56 it is presupposed; in x. 26; xviii. 20 reference is made to the Old Testament commandments; and in xvi. 29–31 to the permanent significance of Moses and the prophets. Narratives and sayings which might be interpreted in an anti-Pauline sense, are omitted (comp. No. 4, note 2), or illustrated and explained by a new combination (xvi. 16 ff.).

[3] The frequent assumption that this ascetic view of the world is a peculiarity of one of Luke's sources is altogether untenable, since it is stamped on parts which unquestionably proceed from the Apostolic source, and recurs in the Acts. Aberle (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1863, 1) claimed for the Gospel a peculiar tendency-character, maintaining that it was written by Paul's legal counsellor as a defence against the reproach that Christianity preached hatred of mankind (comp. on the other hand Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.*, 1864, 4),

Mary and Martha, of Zaccheus, or of the thief on the cross (comp. also the parable of the unjust steward), or by giving an anti-Jewish explanation to parables which Luke himself interprets as anti-Pharisaic (xiv. 15; xv. 1 f.; xvi. 14 ff.); partly by emending xvi. 17 in a Marcionite sense and putting xvi. 16 in unauthorized opposition to Matt. xi. 13.[4] Just as little can evidence be given of a tendency directed against the primitive Apostles. The view that the so-called account of Jesus' wanderings is wholly confined to Samaritan soil, is already precluded by the appearing of the scribes and Pharisees, as well as by the scene in xiii. 31 ff.; Samaria does not represent heathen lands, nor are the seventy disciples types of the Gentile messengers (comp. note 1). Hence a degradation of the Twelve as compared with these cannot be thought of, since they as well as the Seventy received power to drive out devils, and moreover give an account of their success (ix. 1, 10). Even in the part where the Seventy are to take their place, the Twelve are closest to Jesus (ix. 54; xvii. 5; xviii. 31).[5] Hence there only remains the view taken by Baur, viz. that our Gospel was the revision of a hypothetical one-sided Pauline primitive Luke written with a conciliatory aim (comp. Scholten, *Das paulinische Evangelium, deutsch von Redepenning*, Elberfeld, 1881), if not quite in the interest of outspoken Jewish Christianity,

---

[4] The view that Jesus appears from the beginning in Luke as the conqueror of demons, *i.e.* of the powers of heathenism, is incorrect for this reason, that the demon-expulsions practised also by the Jews cannot according to xi. 19 be regarded by Luke in this sense. Nor does Jesus first appear in Luke as in Mark the caster-out of devils, but as the preacher of the fulfilment of Scripture, and while laying much less stress than Mark on the casting out of devils, he gives a warning against attaching too much value to this power in the only case where mention is made of it in advance (x. 17–20).

[5] The observation respecting the defective understanding of the Twelve (xviii. 34) comes solely from Mark (ix. 32) and takes the place of one of the worst examples of such slowness of perception (Mark x. 35–40). A Gospel which furnishes the call of Peter with the miraculous draught of fishes, which in v. 11, 28 (comp. xviii. 18) gives still greater prominence to the fact that the disciples had left all, and omits features such as Matt. xxvi. 35, 56 (Mark xiv. 31, 50), which gives the confession of Peter *without* the reproof that follows it, which combines a pre-eminence of Peter even with the prediction of his denial (xxii. 31 f.) and makes the Risen One appear first to him (xxiv. 34), which promises the Twelve that they shall sit on twelve thrones and commits to them the Gentile mission (xxii. 30; xxiv. 47 f.), cannot possibly intend to degrade them. If x. 20 had been meant to contain an antithesis to Apoc. xxi. 14, the Evangelist would hardly have put Apoc. xi. 2 almost word for word into the mouth of Jesus (xxi. 24).

(comp. Wittichen, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, 4, and *Leben Jesu*, Jena, 1876), for which all support is wanting when once the priority of the Marcionite Gospel over that of Luke had been universally abandoned (comp. § 44, 5); or else with Hilgenfeld and Zeller to regard the author himself as a moderate, conciliatory Pauline, who according to Overbeck was already infected with Judaism. Holsten finally went the length of ascribing to Luke's Gospel the mediation-tendency which according to the earlier Tübingen programme was reserved for Mark; according to which the separation of all that was Judaistic and Pauline in principle led to the recognition of that which both tendencies had in common. Thus the tendency-view which culminated in this difference of opinion refutes itself.

7. Tradition from the time of Irenæus ascribes our Gospel, which was already used by Justin (§ 7, 2), to Luke, who according to Col. iv. 14 (comp. Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11) was a Greek physician, a friend and co-worker of Paul, and his companion in Cæsarea as well as in Rome. Even Irenæus seems to know nothing more definite respecting him than what may be inferred from the Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, on the assumption that Paul's writing travelling-companion there mentioned was this Luke (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 14, 1). Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 4) is the first who professes to know that he was a native of Antioch, and later writers copy the statement from him.

Some, suspecting Eusebius of confounding him with the Cyrenean Lucius in Antioch (Acts xiii. 1), object to his statement on this account; others, such as Hug, Guericke, Bleek and Hilgenfeld (comp. Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, 1882) defend it with more or less confidence. Origen (on this passage) certainly confounds him with the Lucius of Rom. xvi. 21; and yet Luke cannot be another name for Lucius though it might possibly be an abbreviation of Lucanus. To identify the name with Silas (Silvanus; *lucus* = silva) was entirely arbitrary (Hennell, *Untersuchung über den Ursprung des Christenthums*, Stuttgart, 1840; v. Vloten in *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, 2; comp. on the other hand Joh. Cropp, *ibid.*, 1868, 3). Though Paul expressly distinguishes him from the ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς (Col. iv. 11), Eichhorn, Tiele (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1858, 4), Hofmann, Wittichen (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1866; *Zeitschr. f.: wiss. Theol.*, 1873; *Jahrb. f. protest. Theol.*, 1877) and K. Schmidt make him a Jewish Christian, Hug, Bertholdt and others a proselyte. But neither his knowledge of Jewish relations, which he might have acquired in Paul's company, nor

his Hebraizing language, which comes from his sources and gives way in his preface to a Greek that is almost classical, affords any proof of this. It is at variance with the distinct testimony of the author himself (Luke i. 1 f.) when later critics since Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 51, 12) make him one of the Seventy disciples (comp. Hug) or count him the unnamed disciple of Emmaus (Lange, following a conjecture in Theophylact). Nicephorus is the first to make him a painter, in spite of Col. iv. 14.

When Irenæus says that Λουκᾶς ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1) he hardly means that Luke received the material of his Gospel from Paul, since in 10, 1 he calls him the "sectator et discipulus apostolorum," and in 14, 2 makes him transmit what he had learnt from the Apostles, appealing to Luke i. 2 in favour of this view. It was only on the ground that the *prædicatio apostolicorum virorum* needed the *auctoritas magistrorum* (Tert., *Adv. Marc.*, 4, 2, 5) that 2 Cor. viii. 18 was afterwards regarded as a eulogy of Luke's Gospel (comp. Origenes ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 25), and that Paul, when speaking of his Gospel was supposed to refer to Luke (comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, 3, 4); although Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 24) as well as Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 7) has preserved the correct meaning of Luke i. 2. There was therefore no reason to dispute the relation of Luke's Gospel to Paul, said to be adopted solely in the interest of a tendency (comp. Eichhorn, de Wette, Reuss and others), a relation already suggested by its Pauline character (No. 6) and obviously confirmed by the fusion of the Pauline account of the last supper (comp. 1 Cor. xi.) with that of Mark (Luke xxii. 19 f.). Only Thiersch, Aberle and Godet (*Komm.*, 1871) have ventured to maintain that Paul himself gave the historical material to Luke.[1] Though the tradition therefore is by no

[1] To profess to discover traces of medical knowledge in iv. 38 and viii. 43 is mere trifling; and the agreement of xxiv. 34 with 1 Cor. xv. 5 though striking, is not decisive, because the former notice apparently proceeds from Luke's source. What is more important is that the saying of Matt. x. 10 appears in Luke x. 7 in the same form as in 1 Tim. v. 18. Yet this is as little proof of the knowledge and use of Pauline *Epistles* as the

means improbable, a final judgment in the matter can only be pronounced after an examination of the Acts of the Apostles. On the other hand it was quite a mistake to infer on the ground of a false conclusion drawn from the fact of the latter breaking off about the year 63, that the Gospel was composed antecedent to this year (comp. Ebrard, Guericke, Thiersch and in addition Nösgen and L. Schulze); for it is quite evident that the predictions in xix. 43 f.; xxi. 24 were remoulded *ex eventu* and presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem. The fact that the second coming was still expected by the first Christian generation (xxi. 32) hardly allows us to put the date further down than the year 80.[2] Respecting the immediate circumstances of its composition, we have no certain knowledge. The book according to i. 3 is dedicated to a certain Theophilus, who is hardly a mere fictitious person as Volkmar and Aberle, following Epiphanius, assume, though we have no definite knowledge whatever respecting him.[3] This dedication is not

reference to the Pauline account of the last supper. All that has been adduced in its favour (comp. in particular Holtzmann), even that which has actually some show of probability (x. 8, comp. 1 Cor. x. 27; xii. 35 with Eph. vi. 14; xviii. 1, comp. 2 Thess. i. 11; xxi. 34, comp. 1 Thess. v. 3) amounts solely to this, that Luke's mode of expression shows a certain affinity with the Pauline, which cannot appear strange in the case of a companion of Paul's. A really kindred thought which points by similarity of expression to a Pauline one, is nowhere to be found.

[2] When Hilgenfeld and Volkmar come down to the beginning of the second century, and Baur, Zeller and others even beyond 130, their conclusions are entirely arbitrary. In support of them Holtzmann and Krenkel (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, 1880), Keim, Hausrath, Wittichen and others have recently maintained that Luke was dependent on Josephus. Compare on the other hand Schürer (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1870) and Nösgen (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1879).

[3] The usual assumption that he was a man of eminence is entirely uncertain; for the address κράτιστε (i. 3; comp. Acts xxiii. 46; xxiv. 3; xxvi. 25) is wanting in Acts i. 1 and is therefore hardly a title. Nösgen makes him a treasury official in the territory of King Agrippa II. (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1880, 1),

of course inconsistent with its having been destined for a larger circle of readers; and the manifest regard to Pauline Gentile Christians (No. 6), as also the explanation of places in Palestine (i. 26; iv. 31; xxiii. 51; xxiv. 13), shows that this circle is to be looked for in the distant heathen world. The readers' acquaintance with Italian localities, implied in Acts xxviii. 13, 15, is in favour of its being sought in Italy. All conjectures as to the place of composition are however quite visionary and have no value whatever.[4]

§ 49. The Acts of the Apostles.

1. The author of Luke's Gospel himself describes it as a first part, a narrative only of the beginning of the work and teaching of Jesus, and desires that the ministry of the Apostles whom the Lord had empowered for that purpose by His forty days' appearances and by the preparation of the Spirit which He had promised them, should be regarded as a continuation of it (Acts i. 1–5). He therefore begins with the ascension, on which occasion Jesus expressly authorizes them to bear witness to Him in Jerusalem and all Judea, in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth (i. 6–11, comp. more especially vers. 8), and shows how the Apostles, at Peter's instigation and by way of preparation for the carrying out of this mission, began by filling up by lot, with an appeal to Jesus, the gap that had arisen in their number by the secession of Judas (i. 12–26). Then follow the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, the founding of the Church at Jerusalem by Peter's preaching and the institution of baptism, as also a description of the

[4] Jerome (*præf. in Matt.*) makes out that it was written in "Achajæ Bœotiæque partibus," while Godet supposes Corinth in particular. Michaelis, Schott, Thiersch and others settled on Cæsarea; Hug, Ewald, Holtzmann, Keim and others on Rome; Köstlin and Hilgenfeld on Asia Minor. Comp. § 50, 7, note 3.

social life of the Christians (chap. ii.). All else which the *first part* narrates of the history of this Church visibly centres in the growing conflict between it and the heads of the nation. The healing of a lame man by Peter and his discourse on that occasion (chap. iii.) lead to the first interposition of the chief council, which, notwithstanding Peter's defence, ends with a prohibition of his preaching. This, however, only impelled the Church to more zealous prayer, to which God accorded a miraculous answer (iv. 1–31). A fresh description of the life of love led by the Church, cleansed from incipient impurity by the judgment on Ananias and Sapphira (iv. 32–v. 11), as also of its growth by the Apostles' miracle-working power especially that of Peter (v. 12–16), introduces a second solemn transaction before the chief council. As a consequence of this the Apostles are punished for infringement of the prohibition against preaching, but are only by this means stimulated to a more zealous proclamation of the Gospel (v. 17–42). In the same way the choice of almoners (vi. 1–7) only forms the introduction to the successful labours of Stephen and to the stirring up of the people against him (vi. 8–15); which ends with his martyrdom after he had made a speech in his defence (chap. vii.). A general persecution now arises for the first time, by which the Church at Jerusalem is dispersed; occasion being thus given for the preaching of the Gospel in wider circles (viii. 1–4).[1]

2. In exact agreement with the programme set by Jesus Himself for the mission (i. 8), the *second part* begins with the conversion of Samaria by Philip, to which Peter's conflict with Simon the Sorcerer is attached (viii. 5–24).

[1] This narrative of the founding and fortunes of the first Church in Jerusalem, in which Peter plays a leading part, manifestly forms in the author's view a united whole. It is quite in his literary manner to make the appearance of Saul in the history of Stephen (vii. 58, 60; viii. 3) and the intimation in viii. 1–4 prepare the way for what follows.

Samaria however being only a half-heathen country, this account is followed by the conversion of the Ethiopian chamberlain by Philip, which, he being a proselyte from Judaism, represents the transition to the Gentile mission proper (viii. 26–40). But before this can be accomplished, it is necessary for Christ Himself to prepare a specific instrument for it by the conversion of Saul, whose first experiences point the way to distant Gentile countries (ix. 1–30, comp. in particular ix. 15). Now first follows the great section in which Peter is led by miraculous providences to the first baptism of one who was uncircumcised. It is introduced by the Apostle's visitation-journey to the Phenician coast (ix. 31–43) from which he is called to Cæsarea to the centurion Cornelius by divine intimation; and it relates how Peter converted him by his preaching (chap. x.), concluding with his defence of his conduct, in Jerusalem (xi. 1–18). In Antioch we have the founding of an entire Church which is mainly composed of Hellenes, and in which Saul as well as Barnabas finds room for successful activity (xi. 19–26). With the account of the collection-journey from there to Jerusalem undertaken by these two, is interwoven the narrative of the execution of James by King Herod and of the incarceration of Peter, who only escaped the same fate by his miraculous deliverance from the prison (xi. 27–xii. 25). They are manifestly intended to be witnesses of the way in which the final hardening of Israel against the Gospel is set forth in the person of the king speedily overtaken by divine punishment; for it is not without significance that the resolution to undertake a first real missionary journey is made after this very experience in Antioch (xiii. 1 ff.). They go first to Cyprus where they preach in the synagogues, and after vanquishing a false prophet, gain over to the faith the proconsul who was already inclined to Judaism (xiii. 4–12). In Pisidian Antioch we have an example of Paul's powerful preaching

in the synagogue, which leads to a rupture with Judaism and to the solemn proclamation of the Gentile mission (xiii. 13–52). In Iconium and particularly in Lystra, we see the missionaries gain more and more success among the Gentiles, though pursued at the same time by the hatred of the Jews with ever-increasing fanaticism (xiv. 1–20), until, their work being accomplished, they enter on the homeward journey (xiv. 21–28). But the way for the Gospel to pass from the Jews to the Gentiles was not yet made easy, so long as the latter were not secured against the necessity of first becoming Jews by the adoption of the circumcision, in order to participate in salvation. Hence there follow the solemn transactions at Jerusalem in which the Gentiles are formally exempted from the adoption of the law (xv. 1–33). The Apostle Paul is now able for the first time to turn with unabated joy to his proper Gentile mission.

3. How completely the *third* part makes Paul personally the real actor is shown by the detailed way in which xv. 35–xvi. 5 narrates how it came about that he made his second journey not with Barnabas and Mark, but with Silas and Timotheus. Then, after it has been shown how he was led to Philippi by manifest Divine guidance (xvi. 6–12), we have an account of the conversion of Lydia in that place, which is immediately followed by the events that brought about his imprisonment and release, and ultimately his departure from Philippi (xvi. 13–40). Of Thessalonica we hear only that Paul preached there in the synagogue, at first not without success, gaining many proselytes, until the enmity of the Jews who accused him to the rulers of the city, compelled him to leave that place and soon to fly from Berea also, where in the beginning he had promise of still more favourable results (xvii. 1–15). Paul's temporary abode in Athens is then employed for the purpose of giving a richly-coloured example of his missionary preaching among the Gentiles, in his discourse

on the Areopagus (xvii. 16–34). Of his more than one and a half year's ministry in Corinth, we have, apart from the acquaintanceship with Aquila and Priscilla, only a more detailed description of the crisis when the breach with the Jews came to a head, by which the Apostle was led to turn entirely to the Gentiles; as also of the way in which the accusation of the Jews was set aside by the Proconsul (xviii. 1–17). His return through Ephesus to Antioch concludes the description of the Macedonian-Greek mission (xviii. 18–22), and xviii. 19 ff. prepares the way for his settlement in Ephesus, which from this point forms the centre of the narrative. After an introductory account of the way in which Apollos was there prepared by Aquila and Priscilla for his Corinthian labours and sent out (xviii. 24–28), the narrative turns to the permanent and successful activity of Paul in that place. But apart from his meeting with the adherents of John's baptism (xix. 1–7) and his secession from the synagogue (xix. 8–10), we have only a few anecdotal outlines of this time, intended to illustrate his great power over Jewish and heathen superstition (xix. 11–20). On the other hand the Apostle's plan to go to Rome, after visiting his European missionary-field and Jerusalem, now appears, in preparation for which he sends Timotheus and Erastus to Macedonia (xix. 21 f.). Then, after a very full account of the events to which the tumult stirred up by Demetrius the goldsmith gave rise (xix. 23–41), Paul carries out the plan of his journey through Macedonia and Hellas, but is prevented by the snares of the Jews from choosing the direct sea-route to Syria, and thus comes once more to Philippi and Troas (xx. 1–12). He then calls the Ephesian presbyters to Miletus; where his long farewell speech with its references to his work among them and his final leave-taking with many tears (xx. 13–38), brings the Ephesian section to an end.

4. The Apostle's prediction in his farewell discourse (xx.

22 ff.) has already prepared us for the contents of the *fourth* part. In the detailed account of the journey to Jerusalem the narrator is specially interested in the repeated attempts to dissuade the Apostle from it; against which he remains steadfast until he has reached the end he had in view (xxi. 1–16). We are told at length how he there endeavours to silence the distrustful Jewish-Christians, by taking a Nazarite vow upon himself, but how on his carrying out the plan an uproar of the people took place, by which he fell into the power of the Roman magistracy (xxi. 17–40). Then follows the first speech to the people in his defence, by permission of the military tribune (xxii. 1–21), and the account of his being saved from scourging by appealing to his Roman citizenship (xxii. 22–29). The treatment of his case before the chief council only led to a division between the Pharisees and Sadducees; and when the tribune had saved him from the fanaticism thus inflamed, he received the Divine assurance that he should bear witness also at Rome (xxiii. 1–11). A conspiracy against his life is discovered; and the tribune sends him under strong escort to Cæsarea, to the Procurator Felix, with a letter of convoy written *in extenso* (xxiii. 12–35). In Felix' presence Paul again defends himself against the legal counsellor of the Sanhedrin, but Felix puts off the Apostle's case for two years until his relinquishment of office (chap. xxiv.); and when his successor Festus seems about to deliver him up to the Sanhedrin, Paul finds it necessary to appeal to the emperor (xxv. 1–12). Agrippa then appears in Cæsarea; and after Festus has posted him up in Paul's case, it is once more discussed by the king's desire in his presence (xxv. 13–26). Paul has thus a third opportunity of defending himself before the Jewish king (xxvi. 1–23); and the result is that Agrippa declares he might have been set free if he had not appealed (xxvi. 24–32). Then follows the transport-journey to Rome with the shipwreck at Malta (chap. xxvii.),

the wintering on the island (xxviii. 1–10) and the completion of the journey to Rome (xxviii. 11–16). The Apostle there puts himself at once in connection with the heads of the Jewish nation, but the transactions with them end in his announcement to them of judicial hardening and his turning to the Gentiles (xxviii. 17–28). With a glance at the two years' labour in Rome, according to which it was specifically Gentile-Christian (xxviii. 29 f.), the Acts of the Apostles conclude.

No proper indications respecting the division of the Acts are to be found in the continuous flowing narrative. There can, however, be no doubt as to the closing of the first part at viii. 4 (naturally not vi. 7, as L. Schulze maintains), and from this at least so much is clear, that the twofold division which puts the leading section between chaps. xii. and xiii. (comp. de Wette and the 4th edition of his Commentary by Overbeck, 1870; Klostermann, *Vindic. Lucanæ*, Götting., 1865; Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1885) or the threefold division which puts the first leading section in the same place (comp. Nösgen, *Komm.*, 1882), does not coincide with the author's meaning. The section which forms the transition to the Gentile mission closes with chap. xv. (comp. Hilgenfeld); hence neither can that threefold division be correct which makes the second part extend only to chap. xii. (comp. also Baumgarten, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Halle, 1852; 2 Ausg., Braunschweig, 1859). But the actual missionary activity of Paul is so sharply separated in its contents from the narrative of his last fortunes which lead him to Rome, that it is advisable to regard this as a distinct part; only in this case we must not of course make it begin with xx. 1, as Nösgen does, or even with L. Schulze at xix. 21. Whether we then put the first two and the last two parts together, which must in a certain sense be done in inquiring into the sources, and thus return to the two-fold division, is practically immaterial; but the significant division of the first part at viii. 4 must not be ignored.

5. Even a survey of the contents of the book shows that it does not profess to be a history of the Apostles, as the old title of the book (§ 9, 3) would lead us to expect, or of the Church in a comprehensive sense; but that the material taken from this history is here selected and set forth from a definite point of view.[1] It is vain to suppose that the

[1] Notwithstanding the significant way in which the twelve Apostles

author had perhaps only fragmentary material at command, or to assume that all the rest was known to his readers, which is *à priori* quite improbable. The former is no doubt in many instances the case; but this does not suffice to explain a composition so full of design as that of the book in question. It is likewise certain that consideration for the need of the readers influenced its form; this need however did not consist in historical knowledge but in a religious understanding of the course of development which the preaching of the gospel had taken. Just as this course is already indicated in the missionary command of Jesus (i. 8), so the whole delineation of the founding and development of the Church at Jerusalem in the first part is only intelligible on the supposition of an interest in representing how the increasing enmity of the Jews to the Gospel finally led to the dispersion of the primitive Church and so to the spread of the gospel into wider circles. Still more clearly does it appear in the second part that it was a Divinely purposed and directed development which led Philip to the baptism of the first proselyte (viii. 26, 29), Peter to the baptism of the first Gentile (x. 28 f.; xi. 18), and, after God's judgment on the enmity of the Jews, the Gentile messengers to their first missionary journey (xiii. 2). It

are enumerated in the introductory chapter, the sons of Zebedee alone are mentioned in passing; of many Apostolic disciples, such as Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, Apollos, and even of Mark, we are told much more than of them. Peter it is true is put forward with as much significance in the first part as Paul in the last; but the former disappears from the history in xii. 17, nor is any explanation given of his reappearance in Jerusalem (chap. xv.); and not only have we no account of his end, but merely a very fragmentary notice of his personal fortunes, as a glance at 2 Cor. xi. shows. A Church-history cannot be intended, since it is only of the internal development of the Church at Jerusalem that we are told anything definite; nor yet a history of the Christian (comp. Eichhorn) or at least the Pauline mission (comp. Credner), since the former only begins with chap. viii. and the latter with chap. xiii.; while from chap. xx. down to the concluding words of the book, no further mention is made of the mission.

was the same Divine guidance which prepared in Paul an instrument for the Gentile mission (ix. 15); and after the enmity of the Jews had thwarted his first attempts in the Jewish mission (ix. 23, 29), led him to find his true sphere of activity in the Gentile-Christian Church at Antioch (xi. 25), to be directed to the Gentiles on his first missionary journey, by the enmity of the Jews (xiii. 46 f.), and to have the way to the Gentile mission opened up to him by the primitive Church (xv. 28 f.). The third part shows most clearly how it was the finger of God that led the Apostle Paul to his European mission-field (xvi. 6 f., 9 f.); and how the enmity of the Jews here again drives him further and further in this direction (xvii. 10, 14), until in Corinth and Ephesus it opens the way for his going over to the Gentile mission proper (xviii. 6; xix. 9). Above all, the detailed representation of the first part is only intelligible on the assumption that the narrator's real aim is to show how all the enmity of the Jews, which seems to thwart his human plans, only serves to open up a way for the Apostle to Rome (xxii. 11); until after wonderful signs of Divine guidance and deliverance (chap. xxvii.) he arrives in that city and there again finds that the enmity of the Jews points out his path to the Gentiles (xxviii. 25–28). It cannot therefore be denied that the book is intended to set forth the development of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, from the metropolis of Judaism to the capital of the world, and therewith the transition of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles, carried out under Divine guidance through the guilt of the former.

These fundamental thoughts of the Acts of the Apostles have already been set forth with substantial correctness by Mayerhoff (*Einleitung in die petrinischen Schriften*, Hamburg, 1835), Guericke, Lekebusch (*Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*, Gotha, 1854) and Baumgarten. It has been vainly contended on the other hand that Rome at the time when our book was composed had not yet by any means such great importance for Christianity; but since Paul had

already clearly recognised the importance which the Church in the world's capital must eventually have for the Gentile Church as a whole, as shown by his Roman Epistle, his disciple, as he is pourtrayed in the Gospel (§ 48, 6), may very probably have regarded a firm foundation for the mission of Christianity to the world as having been laid in the establishment of Christianity in Rome (i. 8). The fact that we have no account of the founding of the Church in that place proves nothing to the contrary, for the author looks on Paul's three years' ministry there as having prepared a place for the (Pauline) gospel, by which the importance of the community for the great Gentile Church was secured. On the other hand it is this view of the Acts that alone adequately explains its breaking off with Paul's two years' ministry in Rome, making it unnecessary to assume that the author had still a τρίτος λόγος in view (Credner, Ewald, Meyer and Jacobsen; comp. also Weizsäcker and Mangold). Nösgen has put the narrative of the Acts in too close relation to the fundamental ideas of Rom. ix.–xi.; while K. Schmidt (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, Erlangen, 1882), following Hofmann, has put the whole emphasis on the separation of the gospel from the Jewish nation.

6. It was natural to attribute to so systematic a work a special doctrinal tendency; and yet even in its extended discourses the Acts contains far too little actual doctrine for such a purpose. Though some, as Meyer and de Wette, talk of a confirmation of Pauline teaching or a defence of Pauline Christianity, yet the characteristic doctrines of Paul are scarcely touched upon, though perhaps referred to in xiii. 39; xxvi. 18.[1] At the same time it was only the destination of the gospel for the Gentiles that could be treated

[1] On behalf of this view, appeal is made to the gospel (i. 4), on the assumption, mostly regarded as self-evident, that the preface of the Gospel refers also to the Acts (comp. in particular Schleiermacher, Credner, Baur, Volkmar and Nösgen). But this assumption has been contested with perfect justice by Schneckenburger (*über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, Bern, 1841), Lekebusch, Zeller (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1854), Oertel (*Paulus in der Apostelgeschichte*, Halle, 1868), Overbeck, Reuss and others. The preface in question speaks only of the delineation of those completed facts attested by eye-witnesses, while much is narrated here as having been experienced by the author himself. Nowhere does the Gospel point forward to the Acts (not even in xxi. 13, 15, or by the omission of Acts vi. 14 in Luke xxii. 66 ff., as Holtzmann supposes); nor is the latter connected with the above preface, but has a preface of its own in Acts i. 1–5, which links on to Luke xxiv. 29.

of, as already seen by Michaelis; this however does not appear in our book as a doctrine of Paul's, but as in accordance with the gospel it must necessarily be, the will of Christ, to the accomplishment of which the fortunes of Peter and Paul must be subservient. Inasmuch therefore as Paul incurred great hostility from the Judaists, just because he brought the gospel to the Gentiles as such; the evidence that the passing of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles was Divinely ordained and resulted from the guilt of the former, is itself an apology for the Gentile Apostle who only followed the Divine leading throughout, whether accorded to him directly, or indirectly by his experiences. But this apology is not equivalent to an antithesis within Christianity itself. For the very purpose of showing that he gave no offence by his conduct to the Jews who rejected his preaching, we have an account of the circumcision of Timothy (xvi. 3, διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους) at the beginning of his proper Gentile mission; reference being made to it as a refutation of the calumny of the Jews against him (xxi. 22 ff.); while his new and successful speeches in his defence are brought forward as evidence that he was entirely innocent of the hatred with which he was pursued by unbelieving Judaism. It is certainly not without design that such intentional prominence is given to Paul's close relations to the primitive Church, as also to his preparation for the Gentile mission by its authorities; or that so detailed an account is given of the transactions with regard to the emancipation of the Gentile-Christians from the law; for the process of development is certainly not intended to appear as the work of Paul, but as the necessary result of the Church's guidance by its exalted Lord. That the Apostle's defence against Jewish-Christian attacks was in any sense the object of the work, cannot be proved.

Following the precedent of Griesbach and Frisch (in *Dissertationen* of 1798, 1807) and in pursuance of hints given by Baur (No. 7), Schnecken-

burger tried to explain the entire composition of the Acts by assuming that its aim was to defend the Apostle against all the reproaches of the Judaists. The view that a parallel between Paul and Peter, in their miracles as well as their sufferings,[2] runs through the book, is certainly forced; and it is quite a mistake to suppose that Paul by his journeys to Jerusalem, his keeping of feasts and religious exercises is meant to be represented throughout as a pious Jew.[3] The detailed discussion of his quarrel with Barnabas (xv. 36–39) is opposed to the view that prominence is given to his friendly relations with the men of the primitive Church in the interest of a tendency; while the assumption that

---

[2] When Peter heals a lame man in Lydda (ix. 33) as well as in Jerusalem (chap. iii.), it is clear that similar cases were of frequent occurrence (comp. viii. 7), and hence that the healing of the lame man in Lystra by Paul (chap. xiv.) cannot be meant as a counterpart; on the other hand neither the healing of the man who was sick of a fever at Malta, nor the casting out of a devil in Philippi, has a counterpart in Peter, since the expulsion of devils is only mentioned in xv. 16 in quite a general way (and according to v. 16 is certainly attributed to the Apostles generally, just as in viii. 7 to Philip). Whether a raising from the dead did actually take place on occasion of the incident at Troas (xx. 9 f.), is left much too obscure to admit of the assumption that a counterpart to the raising of the dead at Joppa (ix. 40) could here be intended. To make Peter's scene with the sorcerer Simon, who by no means assumes a hostile attitude towards him, a parallel to that of Paul with the sorcerer Elymas, whose blinding is further said to form the counterpart to the so-called punitive miracle of Peter (Acts v.), or to make Paul's laying on of hands (xix. 6) a parallel to that of the primitive Apostles (viii. 17), although the same thing is done by Ananias with similar effect (ix. 17 f.), is entirely forced.

[3] His first journey to Jerusalem has exactly the same object as in Gal. i. 18, viz. to make the acquaintance of the primitive Apostles (ix. 27), his second in which he by no means appears as the actor was for the purpose of delivering a collection (xi. 30; xii. 25), the third (Acts xv.) has its object confirmed by Gal. ii., while the fourth is so obscurely intimated in xviii. 22 that it is even yet a matter of doubt whether the words imply such a journey (§ 15, 7; note 2). The celebration of the Passover in xx. 6 only comes into consideration as a determination of time; and the intention of celebrating Pentecost in Jerusalem (xx. 16) appears from what follows to have been given up, for its fulfilment is certainly not implied in xxiv. 11. Paul's vow (§ 15, 7, note 1) is so slightly mentioned in xviii. 18, that it is still disputed whether the reference be to him or Aquila, and the Nazarite vow (xxi. 26) is accounted for in a way that is entirely credible (§ 24, 1, note 2).

silence is observed respecting his conflicts with the Judaists in behalf of a similar interest is excluded by the detailed description of their thorough defeats in chap. xv., upon which alone stress is laid in the context, as also by the almost exaggerated mention of them in xxi. 20, where it is important to the narrative; the silence regarding the dispute at Antioch, attributed to a tendency-interest, is sufficiently explained by the fact that the book in accordance with its whole plan in no case enters into the inner development of the Churches; while the collection said to be passed over in silence is abruptly mentioned in xxiv. 17. The view that silence is intentionally preserved with regard to the sufferings of the Apostle (2 Cor. xi.), and that his visions are legitimated by those of Peter (chap. x.), is very far-fetched.[4]

The fact that the alleged aim of the Acts does not suffice for the explanation of every single detail, does not invalidate this aim. In many cases the author was naturally influenced by the fulness or poverty of his (oral or written) sources (comp. No. 5); while a special interest for the author, which can no longer be explained, undoubtedly attached to this or that particular. Moreover much is visibly conditioned by the artistic composition of the whole; for example Paul's three great defensive discourses in the last part (before the people chap. xxii., before Felix chap. xxiv., before Agrippa chap. xxvi.), manifestly correspond to the three great speeches in the earlier parts (before Jews chap. xiii., before Gentiles chap. xvii., before Christians chap. xx.).

7. It is imperative that an historical narrative which is dominated throughout by a definite view, should not be incorrect, if as in our case, this view is derived from the history itself and not obtruded on it; if looked at from the standpoint of an historical source, it may be said to be one-sided. The Acts, however, is not by any means

[4] Nevertheless even Klostermann found it possible to assume from Hofmann's standpoint (comp. No. 5) that Paul is defended against the reproach of being a wanton disturber of the religion of his fathers; while Aberle too (comp. also Ebrard) interprets this writing of Luke's as a defence against the accusations pending against Paul (comp. *Tüb. theol. Quartalschr.*, 1855, 63, and on the other hand Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1864).

an historical writing in our sense of the word, but is intended to enable the great crisis manifested in the history of primitive Christianity to be understood in its deepest motives and rightly judged from a religious standpoint.[1] The account it gives is no doubt sometimes inexact, as may still be shown from the Pauline Epistles; respecting the beginnings of Paul (§ 13, 3), perhaps also with regard to the circumstances of the second journey to Jerusalem (§ 13, 4) and respecting the missions of Silas and Timothy (§ 15, 5, note 1) it is imperfectly instructed; and this must be the case in many passages regarding which we are no longer in a position to adduce evidence. It must likewise be conceded that the relations of the primitive Christian time are in many cases no longer quite clear to the narrator.[2]

[1] The way in which the history of the mission is from chap. xi. still attached solely to Antioch, and from chap. xv. almost exclusively to the person of Paul, certainly gives an incorrect picture, if we infer from it that the primitive Church did nothing for the spread of Christianity (§ 14, 2, 5, note 2). Undoubtedly the narrative of the founding of the Macedonian Churches, in which the author follows only those points of view that had importance in his own view, gives a totally inadequate description of them, which we have to supplement by the Pauline Epistles (§ 15, 3, 4). An account of the inner development of the Church ought certainly not to pass over the dispute at Antioch, nor the Galatian and Corinthian disturbances; but the Acts does not claim to be such an account.

[2] Just as he no longer rightly apprehends the original sense of the Apostolic decree (xxi. 25, comp. § 14, 4, note 3), and has perhaps erroneously made Paul publish it in the Lycaonian Churches (xvi. 4, comp. § 15, 1, note 4), so too in attempting to give a sermon preached by Paul in the synagogue, he has probably somewhat effaced its unique character by the infusion of reminiscences of Petrine discourses, and has certainly not reproduced his doctrine of justification in its genuine form (xiii. 39); but this cannot appear strange after § 48, 6. Just as in the dispute between the parties of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, he has perhaps unduly emphasized their dogmatic differences (xxiii. 8, comp. iv. 1 f. and with it § 50, 2), so in Paul's defensive discourses he has probably not given adequate expression to the Apostle's fundamental position with regard to the law, and in emphasizing his advocacy of the hope of Israel has attached too onesided an importance to the question of the resurrection.

But in all this there is not the smallest support for the assertion of the Tübingen school that the author in the interest of a tendency gave a different representation throughout of relations with which he was perfectly familiar, in order, after having smoothed away the conflicting antitheses of the Apostolic period by mutual concessions, to effect a reconciliation between them by setting forth this mediating standpoint as the original one.

In the *Tübingen Zeitschr.* (1836, 3; 38, 3) Baur had already treated the narrative of the Acts as not purely historical; but afterwards in view of the evidence alleged by Schneckenburger of a tendency-representation (No. 6) throughout (though only in the choice of material) he endeavoured to prove in his *Paulus* (1845) that a representation of this kind must necessarily be altogether untrustworthy and unhistorical. In order to uphold Paulinism over against Judaism which had gained the ascendancy, the author, according to Baur, softens its antithesis to the law and Judaism, throws a veil over Paul's differences with the primitive Apostles, and tries to throw the inner-Christian antithesis into forgetfulness by the common hatred of unbelieving Judaism. Whereas Schwegler (1846) viewed the book in the light of a vindication of the Gentile Apostle and an attempt to mediate, in the form of a history; Zeller (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849–51, comp. his *Apostelgesch.*, Stuttg., 1854) followed out Baur's view by an acute criticism of the Acts in all its details. It is a proposal of peace on the part of a Pauline, who by concessions to Jewish Christianity, endeavours to obtain from it a recognition of Gentile Christianity.[3] Proof of this falsification of history in the interest of conciliation can of course only be drawn from the Pauline Epistles; and from these it has already been shown, that on the contrary the Tübingen idea of an antithesis between Paul and the primitive Apostles is unhistorical, the account of the Acts being quite compatible with the Epistles in every essential particular

[3] According to Zeller he sets aside the chief points of Pauline teaching, leaves the law and circumcision to the Jewish Christians, makes Paul himself a zealous servant of the law, carrying on the Gentile mission only by constraint, under Peter's protection and by the permission of the Jerusalemites. His object is to justify Paul to Jewish Christianity and to influence the Gentile Christians to open the way for an understanding with Jewish Christianity by removing those aspects of Paulinism most offensive to it. In this sense the Pauline part is a great forgery, and the primitive Apostolic part in reality pure fiction.

(comp. esp. § 14).[4] Against the Tübingen school Ebrard came forward in his scientific criticism of the gospel history, especially Baumgarten, who indeed resolved the narrative into a great allegory, while regarding it as trustworthy throughout; as also Meyer and Lekebusch (1854), who however were more temperate in their criticism. Comp. also Trip, *Paulus nach der Apostelgeschichte*, 1866; Oertel, *Paulus und die Apostelgeschichte*, Halle, 1868; and of late K. Schmidt and Nösgen (1882). Even in Hilgenfeld we have a very modified form of the customary criticism with regard to the Acts; while critics such as Reuss, Grimm, Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker and Keim have acknowledged the trustworthy character of much that has hitherto been strongly disputed, admitting that where we have an actual departure from the historical relations it is not intentional, but is due to the fact that the author took this view of the relations from the standpoint of his time. So far as a tendency to reconcile party-antitheses from this standpoint is conceded, the author is represented as having onesidedly emphasized only those particulars favourable to such a tendency, out of love to it. Thiersch

---

[4] It is by no means correct to say that according to the Acts Peter's Gentile mission was begun and sanctioned by the primitive Church; for the first baptism of a Gentile that took place in it appears an isolated case brought about by special Divine providence, the primitive Church only admitting that Peter's entering in to the Gentiles, evidently commanded by God, was justified (§ 14, 2, note 2). Not even in Acts xv., where according to Gal. ii. there was every inducement for it, is the Gentile mission as such sanctioned by the primitive Church; it is not Peter but the deacon Philip who makes the first step towards breaking through the limits of the Jewish mission pure and simple. The legal question is first discussed at the Apostolic council. Peter and James do not by any means assign reasons for the freedom of the Gentile Christians after the manner of Paul; nor does Paul make the concession of allowing at least a part of the law to be imposed on the Gentiles (§ 14, 4). The way in which Paul according to the Acts is led to his Gentile mission, as also the way in which in pursuance of it he constantly goes after the Jews, is quite in keeping with his declarations in Rom. xi. (§ 13, 6; 14, 5, note 2) and with the nature of the case (comp. also 2 Cor. xi. 24). The enmity of the Jews against him, to which such prominence is given, is fully corroborated by the first Epistle to the Thessalonians (§ 17) as well as by Rom. xv. 31 (comp. Acts xx. 3), and by the way in which success among the Jews and persecutions by Gentiles are frequently related; so that the description is secure against all suspicion of having been fabricated in the interest of a tendency. The circumcision of Timothy (xvi. 3) so hotly contested, and the taking of the Nazarite vow (xxi. 26) are perfectly consistent with the fundamental principles of Paul (§ 15, 1, note 3; § 24, 1, note 2).

even finds it possible to reconcile this with perfect fidelity to the truth.[5]

Apart from the question as to whether such alleged falsification of history can in any way be proved, and whether such refinement is in keeping with the simple character of the narrative, this tendency-view is in itself impossible. To concede circumcision and the obligation to observe the law to Jewish Christians, was impossible after the fall of the temple had made the fulfilment of the latter to a large extent impossible, and would not have healed the breach but have only perpetuated it. The fact of ascribing Pauline doctrine to Peter, and representing him as approving of and inaugurating the Gentile mission so hateful to the Jewish Christians, could only excite bitterness against the slanderous Paulines who sought by silence and obvious lying to whitewash the image of the hated Paul, which was only too well-known.[6] But what hope could there be of gaining over the Paulines to this compromise, when a cri-

[5] On the other hand Holtzmann (in Schenkel's *Bibellex.*, I., 1869) has recently modified his view of a more naïve influence of the author's conciliatory tendency on the narrative, in the direction of the Tübingen tendency-criticism (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1882, 83); while even Mangold has at last admitted a conscious altering in some parts, in consequence of the conciliatory tendency.

[6] It is vain to say that the original antithesis was intended to be thrown into forgetfulness by means of the common hatred against unbelieving Judaism. The fact that their unbelieving fellow-countrymen hated Paul just as much as they hated him themselves and that he himself was furious against them before his conversion, could not make the Jewish Christians more mildly disposed towards him; nor could peace be promoted by the calumniating Paulines attributing the worst persecutions of Christianity to their fellow-countrymen. Neither could the Gentile Christians be gained over in this way, when they saw that the unbelieving Jews hated their Paul no less than the Jewish-Christians, whose opposition to him breaks out in the clearest way in xxi. 20, in spite of all concealment. Internal dissension may certainly be forgotten in face of a common adversary; but unbelieving Israel was by no means an adversary of believing Israel in the same sense as the Gentile Christians.

terion of the Apostolate was set up *à priori* (i. 21 f.; x. 41) which in the view of the Judaists would have excluded Paul from it, and a false position assigned to him with regard to the primitive Apostles which entirely destroyed the independence he continually asserted with so much emphasis. These considerations necessarily led to the view that the Paulinism which speaks in the Acts was already complete; or else that it was no longer a Pauline but on the contrary a Jewish Christian who set forth the history of primitive Christianity in his sense of it.

Bruno Bauer (*Die Apostelgeschichte*, Berlin, 1850) already proceeded on the assumption that the settlement which according to the Tübingen school was first attempted by our book had in fact already been accomplished when this was written, and that the former antithesis had long disappeared and become unintelligible to the standpoint of Christian conservatism, in which Judaism had conquered. Overbeck practically returns to this standpoint (*Komm.*, 1870, comp. also *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1872, 3), and for the most part acknowledges the objections that have been made against the conciliatory tendency. It is certainly possible to transfer the standpoint of his time back to the Apostolic past, but quite impossible to regard the primitive Apostolic standpoint with him as already overpast, and from love of the present to falsify the tradition respecting authority on which it was based (comp. on the other hand Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1871, 1; 72, 3).[7] Hence nothing remained but to make the author of the Acts a Jewish Christian, as done by Wittichen (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873; *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1877, compare to the contrary Bahnsen, *ibid.*, 1879, 1) and Scholten (*das Paulinische Evangelium*, 1881); a Jewish Christian

[7] Overbeck regards the Acts as the attempt of a Pauline to come to an understanding with Paulinism and its founder Paul; of a Pauline for whom the fundamental questions of the Apostolic period had long lost their significance, and who no longer recognised the ideal founding of Gentile Christianity in the Pauline gospel but regarded it as the legitimate fruit of primitive Christianity, making the Hellenists in particular play a quite unhistorical part in its founding. He makes the primitive Apostles represent a standpoint which is no longer that of their time; because it no longer advocates entire adherence to the law on the part of the Jewish Christians, and allows an intentional modification of the Pauline tradition with which the author was acquainted.

who indeed made certain concessions to advancing Gentile Christianity and its Apostle, but sacrificed the independence of both, to Jewish Christianity.

The tendency acceptation of the Acts having proved itself untenable by the fact that it terminated in such contradiction, the historical depreciation of the Acts could now be undertaken only from an entirely different aspect. It is Overbeck more especially, who, following the example of Schwegler and Schneckenburger (comp. even Mangold) has laid chief stress on the political side of the Acts, inasmuch as in addition to a strong national antagonism to Judaism it bears the character of an apology for Christianity over against the Gentiles.[8] Although the tendency-hypothesis here passes entirely into the assumption of a refined falsification, which is the more inconceivable in proportion as the book could have less hope of finding credit if all that it contained were pure invention, yet the judgment as to its credibility depends ultimately on the position of the author with respect to the events which he narrates, viz. on the question as to how far he himself was an eyewitness or possessed sources that could be depended on.

§ 50. The Sources of the Acts.

1. Since Luke's Gospel is almost entirely composed out of sources, it is natural to suppose that the continuation of it

[8] From this standpoint even such features as had hitherto been beyond dispute are said to be pure invention; for example, the Roman citizenship of Paul, his protection by Roman troops, the details of his lawsuit whose delay is said to be attributable only to the violation of duty on the part of a few officials, the conversion of Roman officials, etc. For this reason the Acts makes Paul in conclusion execute the duties of his apostleship in Rome under the protection of the Roman laws, and passes over his end in silence in the interest of a tendency. According to Wittichen the author even means to insinuate to the Gentile Christians that only by adhering closely to Jewish Christianity could they acquire civil security under the protection of Judaism as a *religio licita*.

must also rest upon sources. The uniform linguistic character of Luke's writings has indeed been urged against this view, but in so far as such uniformity actually exists, it only points to a revision of sources throughout, such as is demonstratably present in the Gospel (§ 48, 4, note 1). But as a matter of fact the linguistic character of our book is anything but uniform. It is obvious that the first half is as a whole much more strongly Hebraistic than the second; that the latter is written in purer Greek, more and more so as it proceeds, coming nearer to the language of the prologue of the Gospel; while the lexical stock of words is different in the two halves.[1] So too the close connection of the narrative with its frequent prospecting and retrospecting is an argument solely in favour of a revision of the sources employed, since the same thing is found in the Gospel, and here by no means without exception. Not only however does the linguistic character point to the use of sources but also the contents, especially in the first half. Since we have at all events the work of a Pauline disciple in the continuation of the Gospel, all that belongs to the history of Paul (and this includes the entire second half) might of itself easily rest on oral tradition or on the testimony of eye-witnesses. But the first part contains a fulness of detail respecting the history of the primitive Church which goes far beyond what can be traced back to oral tradition. To such category belong in particular the great speeches of

[1] Expressions are found which occur very frequently, but only in the first part (*σημεῖα κ. τέρατα, ὅσος, ἐξιστάναι, προσκαρτερεῖν*) besides such as occur frequently only in the second part (*καταντᾶν, διαλέγεσθαι, προσλαμβάνεσθαι, ἐπιβαίνειν, ἀσπάζεσθαι, πονηρός, κακεῖ*) and of which it cannot be said, as may perhaps be the case where *κατηγορεῖν, ἀπολογεῖσθαι, ἐγκαλεῖσθαι* (*ἔγκλημα*), are concerned, that they are suggested by the subject of the narrative, especially if we take into consideration such as previously occur separately (*ἐᾶν, σέβεσθαι τ. θεόν, ἀναγγέλλειν, ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, παραλαμβάνειν, διατρίβειν, κράζειν, ἀνάγεσθαι, ἐπίστασθαι, ἐπί* of the duration of time, *διό, ὁδός* metaph., *σήμερον, τὰ περί τινος*, etc.).

this part, which, by those who deny all use of sources, are necessarily regarded as free compositions of the author.[2] But these discourses, as well as many narratives in this part, contain a greater number of allusions to Old Testament stories and passages as well as of Old Testament expressions, than could possibly have been at the disposal of the Gentile-Christian author of the book.

The question respecting the sources of the Acts was first raised by Königsmann (*De Fontibus Comm. Sacr. qui Lucæ nomen præferunt*, 1798), against whom Eichhorn came forward in his Introduction (1810). Riehm too held that the first part was drawn from sources (*De Font. Act. ap. Traj.*, 1821), while Bertholdt and Kuinöl (comp. also Volkmar) specially characterized the κήρυγμα Πέτρου as such. According to Schleiermacher the first part was taken from single written digests, traces of which he thought he still perceived in repetitions and interruptions of the sequence; de Wette, Bleek and likewise Ewald thought of a history of Peter, a memoir of Stephen, and a missionary account in chaps. xiii. and xiv.; for which Schwanbeck (*über die Quellen der Schriften des Lucas*, Darmstadt, 1847), who first attempted to make a really critical separation of the sources, substituted a biography of Barnabas. On the whole, however, discord prevailed; Mayerhoff, Credner, Schneckenburger, Ebrard, Reuss and Lekebusch declared decidedly against the view of written sources, and where these were more or less definitely conceded, as by Guericke, Meyer, Mangold, L. Schulze and even the Tübingen critics, it was nevertheless held that they could

[2] In this case it is commonly overlooked that the custom of classic authors to put declamation into the mouths of their heroes offers no analogy whatever; inasmuch as the Gospel of our author does not give the slightest support to the conjecture that he did so likewise. Conversely the attempt has frequently been made to prove, especially where the Petrine discourses are concerned, that they have too much that is peculiar in linguistic and doctrinal character to have been conceived by the author of the Acts (comp. Seyler, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1832, 1; Weiss, *Krit. Beibl. d. deutschen Zeitschr. f. christl. Wiss.*, 1854, 10, 11; Kähler, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1873). Though all the observations there made may not be tenable or of decided weight, and though in particular the view that traces may still be shown; in various misunderstandings of the Aramæan dialect of the source from which they were drawn, must be abandoned, yet enough remains to make the opinion that the author had written sketches of these discourses before him, in the highest degree probable.

no longer be ascertained.[3] Nösgen attempts to return entirely to oral tradition. In the whole of the second part, where it is possible that a travelling-companion of Paul is the narrator, the question assumes an aspect so entirely different that it requires distinct investigation, in which moreover the position of the various critics with regard to it first comes to be discussed.

2. That the first part, which treats of the history of the primitive Church (§ 49, 1), is based on a source, can be proved, with as much certainty as can be attained in such matters, by a critical analysis of the narrative. It is impossible that the account of making up the number of the twelve Apostles (i. 15–26) should have been composed by the author, who gives no intimation of the importance of this number, with whom the Twelve as such play no part, and who finds his chief hero outside their circle.[1] The narrative of the history of Pentecost (chap. ii.) is pervaded by the contradiction not yet explained by any exegesis, that on the one hand a unique miracle of tongues is incontestably meant to be narrated, while on the other there is much that points to the first manifestation of speaking in tongues; so that here at any rate an older foundation must be distinguished from the revision of the narrator. By this means some uncertainty is imparted to the indications respecting time, place and auditory. But the following Petrine dis-

[3] What Hilgenfeld, Hausrath and others have conjectured respecting the Judaistic πράξεις Πέτρου, is purely imaginary. According to Jacobsen (*Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, Berlin, 1885), who adopts the view of a Barnabas source for chaps. xiii.–xv., chaps. i.–xii. are freely fabricated on the basis solely of Paul's Epistles, partly after evangelical types.

[1] But in this narrative we have the first discourse of Peter, where i. 18 f. is clearly seen to be a foreign interpolation that only obscures the interpretation of the following words of Scripture which the context necessarily requires. Hence the author, whose revising hand is again visible in vers. 16, 22, must have had this discourse before him in a written form, and with it the entire narrative whose beginning is clearly enough seen in i. 14 in the wholly unexplained appearance of the hundred and twenty brethren along with the relatives of Jesus, and women who are entirely unspecified.

course, though likewise showing traces of revision (ii. 14–36), knows nothing of the above miracle of tongues, and therefore certainly proceeds from the source; in the same way ii. 39 contains an allusion to an Old Testament passage, which can only have been applied at first to the calling of the Gentiles, but in the connection in which it is put by the narrator must be referred to the Jews of the Diaspora. Finally the original conclusion of the narrator (ii. 41 f.) may still be clearly distinguished from the explanation appended by the reviser (ii. 43–47).[2] In the next narrative-portion not only do the healing of the lame man and the speech made by Peter (chap. iii.) show clear traces of revision, but the transaction between the chief priests and Peter, which manifestly took place in the court of the temple in presence of the healed man and the people, is transferred, after an arrest that has neither aim nor motive, to a full sitting of the Sanhedrim, which could not possibly have been convoked so speedily (iv. 3–7). So too the interpellation, manifestly called forth by the characterization of the murder of Jesus, indirectly caused by the people themselves, as an outrage needing to be repented of (iii. 13, 17, 19), is traced back in an impossible way to the aversion of the Sadducees to the doctrine of the resurrection (iv. 2) and to the question as to the means by which the miracle was effected (iv. 7, 9). Finally, the limitation of punishment to the prohibition against preaching, iv. 16 ff., is accounted for

[2] Here the Apostles at once perform miracles, although in the following part of the source the healing of the lame man obviously appears as the first of its kind (iii. 11 f.; iv. 16, 21); here the three thousand of the source, which number probably included most of the guests at the feast who immediately returned home (whereas Luke certainly supposes that they were living in Jerusalem, ii. 5), are *all* daily reassembled in the temple and the houses; a manifest impossibility; here the narrator, in accordance with his predilection shown in the Gospel for the giving up of all property (§ 48, 6), describes a universal carrying out of the community of goods, which according to the following narratives derived from the source cannot have taken place.

otherwise than in the simple narrative of the source (iv. 21 f.); and a miraculous effect is substituted for the natural result of the prayer of the Church, iv. 33 f. (which likewise betrays the hand of the reviser), in the strengthening of the Apostles to bear witness of Christ, and in the popular favour accorded to the Church which was distinguished by ardent love (iv. 31).[3] In the source the sacrifice of Barnabas was

[3] Because in the source Peter speaks in the name of the Twelve, and the interference of the chief priests with his preaching naturally refers to his equally guilty companions also, for which reason the plural was there employed (comp. also iv. 13), therefore the narrator represents Peter from the first as accompanied by John (iii. 1, 3) who had no part whatever in the whole transaction, and who, as is especially seen in iii. 4, 11; iv. 13, is constantly named along with him in a way for which no reason can be assigned. The addition of iii. 4 f., which only disturbs the connection, implies that the Apostles are already known as miracle-workers, which is undoubtedly the case according to ii. 43 but not according to the source. The addition of iii. 8 ff., descriptive of the result and impression produced by the miracle of healing is at variance with the simple way in which the source in iii. 11 evidently leads up to the discourse. Here the outrage perpetrated by the people is in accordance with Luke xxiii. 16–21 more fully explained (iii. 13 f., comp. also the unsuitable addition of ἄρχοντες in ver. 17) and its meaning obscured by the prominence given to the raising of Jesus from the dead, which was already implied in ἐδόξασεν (iii. 15) according to the source. Because the Pauline makes Christ of the seed of Abraham, the πατριαί (Luke ii. 4) are explained of the tribes of Israel, contrary to the sense of the passage and the πρῶτον in ver. 26. Between the arrest added by the reviser and the sitting of the Sanhedrim, the way in which the impression of the discourse on the people (iv. 4 *a*) is in the source contrasted with the interruption of the chief priests who were likewise present, is still preserved, awkwardly enough. With these additions may be classed the setting aside of the disciples and the consultation of the Sanhedrim (iv. 15–17), the anticipation of v. 29 in iv. 19 f., impossible here and directly excluded by iv. 29, as also the dismissal with the ambiguous πρὸς τ. ἰδίους (iv. 23). In the prayer the hand of the reviser is seen in the expression in iv. 25, the awkwardness of which is due solely to the insertion of the Holy Ghost (comp. i. 16), in the particular application of the passage from the Psalm, certainly not intended (iv. 27), in the explanatory καὶ βουλή σου (iv. 28), and in the τέρατα κ. σημ. γίνεσθαι in iv. 30, which is also an awkward expression. The incongruous account in iv 32–35 can only be explained on the assumption that the reviser again tacks on his description of the community of goods to the result of the prayer as recorded in the source (comp. note 1); a description that is in direct contradiction to the history which immediately follows in the source.

evidently only an illustration of this loving zeal (iv. 36 f.) and formed the transition to the hypocritical imitation of it by Ananias and Sapphira, who were immediately overtaken by punishment for having tempted God; an act merely apprehended by the reviser as an offence against the spirit animating the Apostles (v. 3, 9). Another narrative portion describes the timid reverence of the people for the Apostles (v. 14, 16) and the open preaching by the latter in the temple (v. 21) which leads on to their being cited before the chief council (v. 25 f.), where the proceedings relative to their disobedience to the prohibition against preaching end in disciplinary punishment (v. 28–41). Here all difficulties are removed simply by assuming a revision.[4] Although it is only Peter's acts and speeches which have been hitherto traced to this source, there is no reason why the Stephen-episode should not also be referred to it. The profound discourse, testifying to an intimate knowledge of the Old Testament, cannot possibly have been composed by the author of our book; whose additions on the contrary are blamable, if the course of thought and the tendency of the discourse have here and there been rendered obscure.[5] It is therefore proved, that

[4] The very obscure account in v. 12–16 is at once cleared up, if we assume that vers. 14, 16 were added by the reviser, whose hand has also to some extent transformed the introductory ver. 12. The unexplained imprisonment of the Apostle and his entirely motiveless release are undoubtedly embellishments drawn from reminiscences of the later history of Peter (chap. xii.). It is still quite clear from v. 25, that in the source it was the intelligence of the public transgression of the prohibition against preaching (v. 21) that first led to the intervention of the chief priests. The following transactions, down to v. 33 where the intention to slay the Apostles is certainly put too early, may very probably have belonged to the source; while the notorious difficulty in the speech of Gamaliel is got rid of simply by assuming that the reviser inserted the example of Theudas in the wrong place. The conclusion in ver. 42 also unquestionably belongs to his hand.

[5] We see that even the introduction to it (vi. 1-6) comes from the source, by the fact that the augmentation of the Church now comes in

apart from the introduction and the account of the Ascension (i. 1–13), the entire first part of the book proceeds from a Jewish-Christian source undoubtedly emanating from an eye-witness of the events narrated. The revision of this source is seen to be explanatory and embellishing, just as in the Gospel; and even where it blunders, only such traits as were supplied to the author by other narratives of his source were employed. The idea of the rapid growth of the primitive Church and its community of goods, realizing (in the author's view) the ideal of Christian life, is a result of the natural idealization of the Christian primitive time; and has not effaced the contradictory traits of the source any more than the conception of the miracle of tongues at Pentecost or of the Divine omen in iv. 31. Nowhere do we find any trace of a dogmatic or ecclesiastical tendency.

3. Use is also made in the second part of the Acts (§ 49, 2) of a series of pieces from the same source. To these belong in the first place the stories about Philip contained in chap. viii. The first piece is already connected with the source by Peter's transaction with Simon, which forms the leading part of the source, although the introduction alone is important for the pragmatism of the narrator; the second

for the first time, and that the systematic maintenance of widows is taken for granted, in direct contradiction to the repeated descriptions of numerous conversions (comp. also vi. 7) and to a completed community of goods, amid its brevity and obscurity implying a knowledge on the part of the readers of our book of much which they could not have known, without once indicating that the chosen Seven were all Hellenists. Above all the account of the murder of Stephen itself fluctuates between an act of mob-justice and a judicial proceeding; the difficulties of the narrative so often remarked being produced solely by the reviser's having introduced it. So too in the conclusion of the narrative, the imitation of Jesus' words on the cross (vii. 59), the introduction of Paul (vii. 58, 60; viii. 3) and the certainly exaggerated notice respecting the dispersion of the Church (viii. 1 *b*) are additions to a foreign text which ended simply with the statement that notwithstanding the persecution which immediately arose, the last honours were paid to the first martyr.

in accordance with this pragmatism represents the conversion of a true proselyte; which, however, according to Deut. xxiii. 2, a eunuch could not have been.[1] From the source we have also the story of Cornelius with its introduction in ix. 31–43, which has no manner of importance for the pragmatism of the narrator. This is shown not only by x. 42, according to which the twelve Apostles in opposition to i. 8 are destined for Israel, and x. 46 f. where in opposition to chap. ii. the Pentecost story is taken *not* as a miracle of speaking in unknown tongues but as a manifestation of glossolaly, but also by the fact that the reviser, whose hand is likewise visible in other places (comp. for example x. 37 with Luke xxiii. 5; x. 41 with Luke xxiv. 43), adds xi. 1–18, as seen by the many inaccurate references in this part to the previous narrative (comp. vers. 5, 8 f., 10 ff., 14 ff.). From the same source probably comes the history of Peter in xii. 1–17 which gave the narrator a model for his revision of chap. v., and which in all likelihood was simply attached to xii. 23; so that xii. 18–22 is interpolated in accordance with the author's predilection for the data of

[1] It may however be observed, that the great difficulties of the Samaritan story are perhaps got rid of simply by assuming that in the source, Peter, with whom the reviser associates John (as in iii. 4), attracted by the success of Philip, comes to Samaria, and the Samaritans are now received into the Church by baptism. But as the source, owing to the connection with what follows (viii. 18) mentioned only the communication of the Spirit, which of course according to primitive Apostolic views, presupposed baptism; the reviser erroneously understood this to mean that the latter had taken place without the former (viii. 12 f., 16), although the source contains no intimation that in consequence of what Philip had done the communication of the Spirit was looked for in vain, and viii. 14 refers only to the success of his preaching. Moreover the reviser, whose pragmatism led him to assume the conversion of the whole province (viii. 25), thought first of all of the city of Samaria (viii. 5), which according to the source (viii. 14) was evidently not the case. But in the second history the Divine guidance was traced back in the source to the ἄγγελος κυρίου (viii. 26), for which the reviser in accordance with his view substitutes the Spirit (viii. 29, 39).

profane history (§ 48, 4); as may be said above all of the account of the transactions at Jerusalem in chap. xv. It is impossible that the words of Peter and James which are so characteristically distinct (§ 14, 4, note 2) could have been conceived by the author; the transactions themselves, which according to the source are conducted by the Church, according to the reviser by the Apostles and Presbyters, are in the former brought about by a dispute in Jerusalem (ver. 5), by the latter through the dispute at Antioch (vers. 1–4); so that it even becomes doubtful whether the transactions with Paul and Barnabas (Gal. ii.) are actually those referred to by the source (§ 14, 3). The document of the Church, devised by the reviser (vers. 23–29) does not quite agree either in form or matter with the resolutions before adopted, and was probably called forth only by the mention in the source of the sending of Silas and Judas, which must there have had a different meaning (§ 15, 1). That these parts are taken from the source, is clear, however, from the fact that their arrangement is conditioned by the pragmatism of the author and in some measure contradicts indications supplied by themselves.[2] The case is quite different with the Pauline sections of the second part. The accounts of the beginnings of Paul (ix. 1–30) and of the Church at Antioch (xi. 19–30; xii. 25) are in

[2] The story of Cornelius according to xv. 7 must belong to a much earlier time, and shows that the Apostles had already made missionary journeys through Palestine long before chap. viii.; in viii. 26 the description of the way pointed out to Philip clearly implies that he (by whom perhaps the Apostle was intended in the source) was in Jerusalem, thus making the connection of viii. 5 with what goes before very doubtful (§ 14, 2, note 2). Peter's release immediately before the death of Herod Agrippa cannot coincide with the collection-journey chronologically (§ 13, 4, note 2); it implies that James was at the head of the Church (xii. 17), and therefore that Peter had already given up his position there, on account of his missionary-journey; and the ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον, which would be impossible in the source, can only serve to conceal a missionary journey of this kind, which the pragmatism of the author would not allow him to mention here.

themselves so meagre and inexact (§ 49, 7), that they might very well have been written by a Pauline disciple from hearsay. Above all, it was quite a mistake to make the account of a journey by the author himself a necessary foundation for chaps. xiii., xiv., as is still done by Hilgenfeld, Mangold, Jacobsen and others (comp. also No. 1); for this account is in truth so sketchy, giving a picture of the relations of the time and the actual results of the journey so far from clear that it too was almost certainly composed in accordance with mere hearsay.[3] Actual details are only supplied in the episodes in Paphos and in Lystra (xiii. 6–12; xiv. 8–18), the latter of which certainly shows traces pointing to the revision of a source.[4] But there is not the least occasion on this account for thinking of a special source concerning the life of Paul or the history of the Church at Antioch. On the contrary there is nothing to prevent our assuming that the source which treated of the history of the primitive Church and moreover contained not merely speeches and acts of Peter but also the stories of Stephen and Philip, introduced Paul into the narrative, of which we have perhaps evidence in his being mentioned in vii. 58

[3] The events in Pisidian Antioch are most fully narrated; but the great speech in xiii. 16–41 is manifestly an attempt on the part of Luke to represent the way in which he had heard Paul argue in the synagogue in favour of the Messiahship of Jesus; while the description of the result (xiii. 42–52) is so closely connected with the leading points of view of the narrator (§ 49, 5), that it cannot possibly be borrowed from a source; and the same thing holds good also of the events in Iconium (xiv. 1–7, comp. also iv. 19 f.).

[4] The statement contained in xiv. 6 f. in the introduction to the healing at Lystra is very striking, for the flight to Derbe and the ministry in that place are afterwards related again almost in the same words (xiv. 20 f.); in xiv. 8, 10 the embellishing touches from chap. iii. may still be clearly distinguished from a text which lies at the foundation; and the words of Paul with which the author was no doubt acquainted (ver. 16 f.) interrupt the connection of vers. 15, 18 so awkwardly, that they may very likely have been interpolated by the reviser (comp. also the Βαρν. κ. Παῦλ., vers. 14, which after xiii. 13 gives way to Παῦλ. κ. Βαρν., and with it § 13, 5).

as νεανίας, not quite in keeping with viii. 3; ix. 1. This assumption is absolutely necessary, if Barnabas and Saul were actually present in the source employed in chap. xv.; as seems probable from the position of the two names (xv. 12). For it is impossible that this passage should have contained merely the above bald notice; it must have given a more definite account of their missionary journey and have illustrated the success of the missionaries by examples such as those taken from Paphos and Lystra.[5] The obscurity with regard to this question, which can hardly now be fully cleared up, must not, however, in any way prejudice the certainty with which the use of the source may be pointed out in the Jerusalem sections.

4. If the greater part of the first half of the Acts rests upon a source, it is very natural to form a similar conjecture as to the second part. Traces of such were supposed to be visible in many of the sections where a travelling-companion of Paul is evidently the speaker, for he expressly includes himself by a "we" among the persons of whom the narrative treats.[1] Moreover it is by no means impossible that the wording of such a source should go much farther than is directly shown by the presence of this ἡμεῖς; for it is in accordance with the nature of the subject that

[5] But this again presupposes that reference had already been made in it to the conversion of Saul and his appearance in the primitive Church, as also to his connection with Barnabas; to which account certain striking features in the history of Ananias (ix. 10–19), in ix. 27 f., as also in the history of the Church at Antioch (xi. 19–30, comp. esp. xiii. 1) might be traced.

[1] This peculiarity first appears in xvi. 10 at the setting out from Troas (εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν) and continues to xvi. 17, where the first meeting with the soothsaying damsel at Philippi is described (κατακολουθοῦσα τ. Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν). It recurs in xx. 5 in Philippi (οὗτοι δὲ προελθόντες ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρωάδι) and continues throughout the whole journey to Jerusalem up to xxi. 18 (εἰσήει ὁ Παῦλος σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβον). It appears for the third time in the journey to Rome, from xxvii. 1 (ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς Ἰταλίαν) to xxviii. 16 (εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τ. Ῥώμην).

most of what it has to relate concerned Paul alone, and afforded no opportunity for mentioning the person of the narrator also.[2] On the contrary the entire last part of the Acts, with the exception of the piece from xvi. 10 to xvi. 39 at most, might be taken from this source, beginning with the departure to Jerusalem (xx.–xxviii.). On the other hand it may be said with perfect certainty that not only is it impossible for section xvi. 1–8, where we are not even told of the founding of the Galatian Churches, to be drawn from this source but also chaps. xvii.–xix.; for the communications of the narrator are here much too meagre and inexact, and the choice of what is narrated too fully conditioned by the points of view of the author of the Acts, especially in chaps. xvii. and xviii., to have originated in a source emanating from an eye-witness.[3] But it must be

[2] It is impossible indeed that he could have been in the Apostolic company during the events narrated in xvi. 1–8, otherwise the ἡμεῖς would appear throughout this part also; but in xvi. 18-39 he could not include himself; and it first becomes evident from xvi. 40 that at least at Paul's departure from Philippi he was no longer in his company. Nor do we find any trace of him in chaps. xvii.–xix., although there was frequent opportunity for mentioning him. On the other hand the συνείπετο in xx. 4 makes it very probable that the narrator again accompanied Paul from Corinth (§ 24, 1, note 1), although the ἡμᾶς first occurs in vers. 5; and conversely the absence of the ἡμεῖς in xx. 16–38 by no means interferes with the supposition that it is the travelling-companion who speaks there too. So also the ceasing of the ἡμεῖς at xxi. 18 by no means proves that his narrative stops there, since there was not the most remote possibility of its coming up in xxi. 19–xxvi. 32, nor yet in xxiii. 31 ff. where Paul is brought to Cæsarea under military escort and therefore could not have been accompanied by friends. Just as little can xxviii. 17–28 be regarded as a proof that the travelling-source ceases with xxviii. 16; for the companion has nothing to do with the transactions there recorded; and even in xxviii. 30 f. the exclusive mention of Paul is so entirely in keeping with the aim of our conclusion that it cannot be regarded as evidence that the narrator was no longer in his company.

[3] Nor does the Athenian discourse in chap. xvii. prove the contrary; for since (according to 1 Thess. iii. 1) Paul cannot have had any of his companions there with him, the recording of this discourse can in no

confessed that it is impossible to form a direct conclusion as to the extent of this source from the measure in which our author has used it; since for reasons belonging to his composition he could only make partial use of it, and had to set it aside even in parts where his account is more or less abbreviated; but it is quite improbable that it extended to the first missionary-journey (comp. Hausrath, Holtzmann, *Zeitschr. f. w. Th.*, 1881, 4); of which, as also of the journeys in the second part, more chronological details would in this case have certainly been given (comp. No. 3).

Königsmann was not indisposed to ascribe to Timothy the record of the eye-witness employed by the author in the second half of his work; and since Schleiermacher and de Wette, wide currency has been given to the view that a travelling diary of Timothy lies at its foundation (comp. Bleek, Ulrich, Beyschlag in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1836, 37, 40, 64).[4] But this hypothesis is quite excluded by xx. 4 f., where Timothy belongs to the οὗτοι with whom the narrator contrasts himself by ἡμᾶς; an argument which no subtlety of exegesis in this passage has yet been able to refute. If appeal is made to the fact that Timothy was nevertheless demonstrably with the Apostle in Cæsarea and Rome, it by no means follows from xxiv. 27, xxviii. 30 that the narrator of that part shared the Apostle's imprisonment; though that is

---

case lead to the inference of the use of the source of an ear-witness. On the contrary, like the discourse at Antioch in chap. xiii., it must have been projected in accordance with what the author knew by experience of the Gentile missionary preaching of the Apostle, and from what he had heard of the particular way in which Paul at Athens accommodated himself to that situation. Comp. § 15, 5, note 2.

[4] In favour of this view it is adduced that Timothy was actually received into the company of Paul shortly before the record of the travelling-companion begins (xvi. 3); and yet in this case it is less intelligible than ever why he did not give a fuller account of the journey from Lystra to Troas, of the entire Macedonian-Hellenic mission and the time at Ephesus, and finally of the journey from Ephesus to Corinth where Timothy was demonstrably for the most part in the Apostle's company; or why the author of the Acts, while he frequently mentions him (xvii. 14 f.; xviii. 5; xix. 22) did not make more extensive use of his account. On the contrary the only thing belonging to this time that he relates in detail, viz. the revolt of Demetrius in Ephesus (xix. 23–41), belongs to a period when Timothy, as can be shown, was no longer with Paul.

not impossible. The hypotheses which made Silas (comp. Schwanbeck and of late von Vloten, *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1867, 1871, on the assumption it is true of the identity of Luke and Silvanus, comp. § 48, 7) or Titus (comp. Krenkel in his *Paulus*, 1869, Kneucker, *Auf. des röm. Christenth.*, 1881, Jacobsen after Hitzig) the author of this source are purely visionary. On the other hand the Tübingen criticism (and now Holtzmann and Mangold) has with perfect justice adhered to the opinion that if the Acts is founded on the record of a travelling-companion, he can have been none other than Luke, for only on this assumption is it intelligible how tradition could have come to ascribe the whole work to a companion of Paul's to whom so little prominence is given in the Pauline Epistles.[5]

5. Stringent proof of the use of such a source could only be adduced if the sections belonging to it presented a peculiar phraseology distinct from that of the reviser, such as can be shown in his use of Mark in the Gospel (§ 48, 1, note 2), or in the strongly Hebraizing language of the second half of the book which is based on the Old Testament and conditioned by a Jewish-Christian source.[1] The fact however is incontestable, that a purer and more facile Greek is found in the last part of our book, mainly in those parts which might most readily have been drawn from this source; a Greek which coincides for the most

[5] The fact that we first make his acquaintance in the Captivity Epistles naturally proves nothing whatever to the contrary, since we possess no Pauline Epistles after the time when, according to his account of the journey, he appears continually in the company of the Apostle; the fact of his not being mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians, although according to xvi. 10–17 he was with the Apostle at Philippi, proves at most that he was not in Rome at that time; which however is probable from Phil. ii. 20, and is by no means excluded by Acts xxviii. 30 (*vid. ante*). His use as a Gentile Christian of the Jewish feast-calendar is certainly strange, but may arise simply from his having heard the time reckoned according to it when in Paul's company.

[1] What Zeller and Overbeck have endeavoured to prove in this direction, appears quite unimportant, and certainly has no weight as opposed to the striking similarity of diction in these pieces to that of the most diverse passages of the Gospel and the Acts set forth by Oertel, Klostermann and others, which is much too great to have been stamped on them merely by the reviser.

part with that of the preface to the Gospel (Luke i. 1–4), and therefore certainly points to the latest reviser of the whole work.

Overbeck thought he could show in another respect a peculiar literary character in those sections which the ἡμεῖς leads us to assign to the source, inasmuch as they manifest a predilection for treating of journeys more especially sea-voyages, are distinguished by exact statement as to route as also by chronological and other details, while the points of view characteristic of the narrator recede into the background and the miraculous character stamped on the narratives of healing in particular is absent. But the fact is here overlooked, that in the nature of things the "We" of an eye-witness must necessarily be prominent, especially in recording travelling occurrences which affected Paul's companions just as they affected himself; and that it was equally necessary to give the details in question since no opportunity for asserting his doctrinal points of view presented itself (§ 49, 5); as also that it is only natural if a miraculous character be more strongly stamped on those stories of healing told merely from tradition than on those witnessed by the narrator himself. Hence all these phenomena are equally intelligible if the writer of the above sections had really been a travelling-companion of the Apostle's.[2]

The only question finally remaining is whether the second part of the Acts can be shown to contain phenomena similar to the inequalities and contradictions of the

[2] Since we can form no clear idea of a source containing exclusively the above account of a journey, as even Zeller and Overbeck admit, the question arises, how the author of the Acts, who as a matter of fact followed points of view so entirely different, has adopted only those parts of the said source which contained details apparently so unimportant to him. But although it may be deemed possible to discover motives of some kind for his having given the preference to these, it is incontestable that they are only strengthened if we assume that the author himself was the travelling-companion in question; which accounts for the obvious interest he takes in events he had himself experienced. Add to this, that the above details are by no means of equal accuracy throughout, even in the sections characterized by the "We," so that Overbeck was obliged to assume that the reviser had sometimes obliterated them. The argument drawn from the stories of healing has no importance whatever; for although the narrative of the youth in Troas and of the viper in Malta may certainly be explained in a natural way, this can by no means be said of the healings directly connected with them (xxviii. 7 ff.).

first part, which pointed to the revision of an independent source, by the author of the book. It cannot certainly be denied that such traces are not entirely wanting; but their importance is already diminished by the circumstance that they also occur in the section chaps. xvii.–xix., which cannot in any case be based on the source of an eye-witness. Hence the most that can be inferred is that the author mixed up his recollections of oral traditions with reminiscences of written accounts of the life of Paul such as we found in the second section (No. 3). In any case such phenomena are not entirely wanting even in those sections which are directly related by an eye-witness, or which agree with the parts narrated by him. From the narrative of the catastrophe in Philippi which, owing to xvi. 17 must necessarily have been mentioned in the source, the prison-scene (xvi. 25–34), in itself quite incomprehensible, drops off as a later addition, and without it the narrative runs on quite intelligibly; while the scene at Troas (xx. 7–12) shows many indications of being an embellishment of a shorter account.[3] It is still more remarkable that the farewell discourse at

[3] The way in which xxi. 27 is attached to what goes before may also give rise to the suspicion that the transaction relating to James in v. 19–26 is an interpolation; but since vers. 17 is unintelligible without it, and vers. 20, which is not explained by any part of the earlier narrative, does not look like an interpolation by the reviser, and since xxi. 27, if it does not refer to the days of the Nazarite vow, can only refer to the days of the feast of Pentecost at whose celebration Paul according to xx. 16 (the very passage objected to by criticism) had intended to assist, an intention which according to the chronological statements in the account of the journey he must soon have abandoned however for otherwise his delay at the last stations, which evidently made this impossible, would be incomprehensible (§ 24, 1), and since finally the *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδ.* is sufficiently explained by xx. 3, 19; the above view cannot be carried out. The episodes of the shipwreck, of Paul's vision in a dream and of the last supper (xxvii. 21–26, 33–38), to which Overbeck attaches special importance, and whose narrative-tone is to some extent set off by its surroundings, by no means belong to this category, since they are indissolubly interwoven with the whole context, and the subject fully justifies the peculiarity of expression.

Miletus presents a series of features which, credible as they may be in themselves, have nothing to correspond to them either in the previous or the subsequent narrative, and seem to be directly at variance with it.[4] From this it follows, however, that the episode at Miletus (xxi. 8–14), for the same reasons as that at Cæsarea (xxi. 8–14), cannot possibly have been interpolated by the author of the Acts in the account of an eye-witness, as critics maintain; but that these discourses and utterances must have been recorded by an ear-witness himself, either without regard to the historical narrative in which we now have them interwoven, or else in spite of it, to preserve the special colouring of the particulars there described,—particulars of which he still had a lively remembrance. But this phenomenon repeatedly recurs in the defensive discourses of the last part (chaps. xxii., xxiv., xxvi.), not only in what Paul there relates of his beginnings, in relation to what is told in chap. ix., but also in opposition to the history in which they are interpolated (comp. xxiv. 11, 17). The latter is the case in the account of the military tribune, xxiii. 26–30, and in Festus' description of the events formerly related (xxv. 14–21, 24–27); while even in Paul's transaction with the Jews (xxviii. 17–23), so much disputed and undoubtedly closely bound up with the narrator's points of view, there is much that owes its striking character to the very fact that it is by no means adequately accounted for in

[4] The Ephesian section has no knowledge of snares laid by the Jews, of the appointment of Presbyters or of the Apostle's living by his trade (xx. 19, 28, 33 f.); the three years in xx. 31 appear to contradict chronological statements there made; the prophecies mentioned in xx. 23 were not yet referred to; the entire previous account gives not the slightest occasion for the fear expressed in xx. 29; the Gospel has no knowledge of the words of the Lord alluded to in xx. 35; and the prophecy in xx. 25 was certainly by the author's own account not fulfilled in the sense which from its connection it undoubtedly bears (§ 26, 6); just as little as the prophecy in xxi. 11 or the expectation lying at the basis of xxi. 13.

the previous representation of our book. It would nevertheless be an error to conclude from this that all such discourses were contained in the source of an eye-witness upon which the author of the Acts had lighted, since they could not have been written down at all without the intervening history, and though certainly based on recollections which are substantially true, yet contain much that consists with views of the author which are demonstrably incorrect (comp. *ex.gr.* Paul's return to Jerusalem following directly on his conversion, xxii. 17; xxvi. 20). But if the differences between the narrator's account (xi. 1–18) and that previously given in accordance with a source (No. 3), abundantly seen in the still-remaining contradictions in the sources used by the first half (No. 2) and in much of the same kind in the source-usage of the Gospel; if such differences show that the author's mode of narrative is naïve and careless, and does not recognise as contradictory much that appears so to a keener criticism, yet the said phenomena are too numerous to be traced to the mere accident of a negligent manner of writing. This much alone can be said with certainty, that the hypothesis of the use of a written source does not explain them, but only increases the difficulty of such explanation.

6. Not only can this hypothesis not be proved, but it is irretrievably destroyed by the ἡμεῖς still remaining in the sections alleged to be borrowed from the source. Schwanbeck, it is true, has pointed to chronicles of the middle ages, and Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann to Ezra and Nehemiah, where pieces are adopted from sources, without the personality of the narrator who speaks in them being effaced. But Luke's writings are not a mosaic of this kind; for just so far as the use of a source in the last half of our book seems capable of proof, does this part show a revision so excessively free, that to leave the ἡμεῖς standing, which destroys the whole tenor of the narrative, would have

been a sheer impossibility.[1] Since therefore a source consisting only of those sections characterized by the ἡμεῖς is absolutely inconceivable (No. 4); the representatives of the Timothy-hypothesis have found it necessary to assume that the author sometimes blotted out the ἡμεῖς and sometimes allowed it to remain; an inconsistency quite inconceivable in connection with his literary art. Hence it is that later criticism has frequently adopted the view that the author of the Acts allowed the ἡμεῖς to remain intentionally in order to make it appear that he was an eye-witness; while Overbeck has assumed with regard to two passages at least that he even inserted it for the same reason in pieces that originated with himself (xxi. 17 f.; xxviii. 15). This however is a confession that the reader must conclude from the presence of the ἡμεῖς that the narrator took part in the events that follow. But in such a case, unless the use of the ἡμεῖς be regarded simply as deception, the view we meet with in Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 14, 1; 15, 1), viz. that the author characterizes himself as Paul's travelling-companion for a time, must be the only correct one.[2] Add to

[1] Nor does the closer connection, which is not deficient in references to what has been previously told in parts alleged to be drawn from the source nor in preparation for that which is taken from it, prove anything against the use of such a source, but only against its having been adopted just as it was, as the fact of the ἡμεῖς being suffered to remain would imply.

[2] Moreover we cannot understand how this view can be said to present any difficulty, since Theophilus and the readers for whom the book was designed knew who had written it, as also that he had accompanied Paul from time to time on his journeys, and therefore did not need the introduction of his personality when he included himself by the ἡμεῖς with Paul and his companions. Hence it is scarcely necessary to point out that other persons frequently appear in the book in Paul's company, without any preliminary account as to how they came to be so (xix. 22, 29; xx. 4; xxvii. 2), which could not have happened here without destroying the whole tenor of the narrative, apart from the fact that it was unquestionably known to the hearers. If there is a difficulty here, not only is it not removed, but it is made more difficult by assuming an account of a journey in which the readers could not

this, that we cannot form a right idea of a source which contained only the journey to Jerusalem and that to Rome with the intervening events, and at most also an introduction in which the author gives an account of his first intercourse with Paul; and yet beyond this nothing in it can be proved with any certainty (No. 4). But no sooner do we regard the source as extending beyond the period in which its traces are visible, than it becomes incomprehensible why the author did not use it in other parts of which he has given a very fragmentary account. If we assume with Overbeck that he removed or even replaced by contrary pieces all that did not harmonize with his view, adopting only simple itineraries and records of miracles, this is no longer the use of a source but gross falsification, so that we only wonder why the author should have troubled himself with adjusting this source instead of simply making what he had invented (with a free use of its materials) appear as the account of an eye-witness by introducing the said ἡμεῖς, by which he undoubtedly deceived his readers more or less intentionally. Thus we are again led to ascribe the whole of the second half to Paul's travelling-companion alone. The strange mixture of detailed narrative and excessively scanty notices is best explained by assuming that he accompanied Paul from time to time, but had not collected special intelligence respecting the intervening time, not having then formed the intention of writing his book; and hence could only communicate what he remembered having incidentally heard.[3] The remaining inequalities and

know who was the speaking person and whose author is nevertheless not expressly introduced at the beginning. Moreover if the narrator intentionally left the ἡμεῖς standing in pieces which he altered and interpolated, and even inserted it himself, it is incomprehensible why he did not by this ἡμεῖς represent himself as a travelling-companion throughout the whole section which treats of the journeys of Paul.

[3] A use of Pauline Epistles can as little be proved in the Acts as in the Gospel (§ 48, 7; note 1), but is rather excluded by the way in which

contradictions of the narrative (No. 5) must then be explained on the assumption that the author himself had made notes, or had formerly noted down a series of events with some other object in view, when in connection with his great historical work he began to describe the same things with the help of the above notes but in the spirit of the religious pragmatism which pervades his work and in the style of the whole, making it necessary to give a more detailed account of many occurrences, and not only to reproduce the large discourses of the Apostle from memory, but also to enliven the narrative by the introduction of other persons as speakers.[4]

7. Traces of an acquaintance with this work are already found in the Apostolic Fathers (§ 5, 6, note 4), as also in Justin and Tatian (§ 7, 4, note 1, 7). At the end of the second century it belongs to the New Testament (§ 9, 3), and only heretics such as the extreme Ebionites (Epiph., *Hær.*, 30, 16), the Marcionites (*Tert. c. Marc.*, 5, 2), the Severians (Euseb., *H. E.*, 4, 29) and the Manichæans (August., *De Util.*

the narrator fails to make any use of the rich material they offer, not even avoiding many deviations from them. Echoes such as the ὁ πορθήσας (ix. 21), διὰ τ. τείχους χαλάσαντες (ix. 25) and the many Pauline expressions and ideas are intelligible in the case of one who had perhaps been in Paul's company for years, without cognizance of the Epistles. It is remarkable enough that most real echoes of them may be traced back to the letters which date from the imprisonment at Cæsarea (x. 3 f., comp. Eph. ii. 17; xx. 19, comp. Eph. iv. 2; xx. 32, comp. Eph. i. 18; viii. 21, comp. Col. i. 12; xxvi. 18, comp. Col. i. 22 f.). Comp. also xx. 24 with 2 Tim. iv. 7.

[4] Nösgen and K. Schmidt have arrived at similar views, though from premises that are very different in some respects. The latter maintained that the author wrote the second part, beginning with chap. xiii., earlier than the first, and interpolated in it an earlier writing concerning his journey to Rome with Paul; while the former held that in the sections where the "We" appears, he had only worked up the notes of his own diary. Hence the way in which Philip and Agabus (xxi. 9 ff.) are introduced may also have been allowed to stand from the notes whose existence we have assumed, whereas in the complete work they must naturally have been made known to the reader from the beginning (vi. 5; xi. 28).

Cred., 2, 7) rejected it. But Chrysostom in his homilies complains of the limited circulation of the book, likewise due to the uncertainty of its text. In the Church it has always passed for a work of the Pauline disciple Luke.[1] But nothing definite as to the circumstances of its origin has been handed down to us. The book, like its first part, is dedicated to Theophilus and to the circle of readers represented by him, and naturally cannot have been written until after the Gospel (§ 48, 7), and therefore after the year 80. The traditional view, that the book was written at the time with which it breaks off, hence about 63–64 (comp. L. Schulze), has no support whatever in itself,[2] and is rendered impos-

[1] It is incomprehensible how a fluctuating tradition could have been found in Photius (*Quæst. Amphil.*, 145), where we have a simple interchange with the tradition respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. The genuineness of our book was first disputed by Schrader (in his *Apostel Paulus*, 5 Theil, 1836) who interpreted it as a bundle of legends composed in the anti-Gnostic and hierarchical interest of the second century. The Schleiermacher-de Wette criticism doubted whether a writing, which only used Timothy's diary, proceeded from a Pauline disciple, because it contains so much that is inexact, incorrect and even legendary. Mayerhoff alone attempted to ascribe the whole writing to Timothy, rightly perceiving that the eye-witness himself is the narrator in the second part, although we cannot understand how tradition should have put one who was quite unknown in place of the well-known Pauline disciple. Hennell (*Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Christenthums*, 1840) attributed it to Silas (who in his view was indeed identical with Luke, comp. § 48, 7). On the other hand, if the entire tradition rested solely on the fact that a travelling-diary of Luke's had been turned to account in the book (§ 50, 4), we might bring it down to the time of Trajan, in favour of which view Schwegler already appealed to its apologetic character. Overbeck regarded it as the direct precursor of the apologetics which flourished under the Antonines. Volkmar even endeavoured to put a final clerical revision of it as late as the middle of the second century; whereas Hilgenfeld went back again to the last time of Domitian, and Mangold to the beginning of the nineties.

[2] The close of the book does not say that Paul had *until now* been two years a prisoner, but its meaning is not explained by assuming that Luke was prevented from finishing (comp. Schleiermacher), or that the conclusion was lost (comp. Schott), or that he intended to write a third part, as Credner, Ewald, Meyer and others supposed, or that he suppressed the death of Paul in the interest of some tendency, as even Mangold and

sible by the time of the composition of the Gospel. On the basis of false exegesis Hug and Schneckenburger it is true found in viii. 26 a sign that Gaza was destroyed, and therefore that the book was written after the Jewish war; but even Nösgen's assertion that the aim of the book is only intelligible before the year 70, and that it has respect to the kingdom of Agrippa II. as still continuing, is quite untenable. Apart from what may be inferred from the chronological relation to the Gospel, nothing can be established as to the time of its composition; and conjectures regarding the place where it was composed are entirely visionary.[3]

§ 51. The Gospel of John.

1. The fourth Gospel differs from the earlier ones inasmuch as it claims to proceed from an eye-witness of the life of Jesus. Even in the preface the author classes himself with those who have seen the glory of the Word who was made flesh (i. 14); and towards the end he appeals to his testimony as an eye-witness and to his veracity on behalf of a fact which was of special importance in his view (xix. 34 f.).[1] And since the disciple whom the Lord loved is

Wendt (in Meyer's *Comm.*, 1880) hold along with the Tübingen school, but simply by the fact that the theme of the book was exhausted with the establishment of Christianity at Rome through Paul's two years' ministry.

[3] The view current since Jerome's time (*De Vir. Ill.*, 7). viz. that the Acts was written in Rome, is connected with a false idea as to the time of its composition (comp. L. Schulze); nor is it proved by the different arguments of Schneckenburger, Ewald, Zeller and Lekebusch. Mill transferred the composition of the whole work to Alexandria on the ground of subscriptions to the Gospel in codices and versions; Hilgenfeld, who formerly thought it had been written in Achaia or Macedonia (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1858), now adheres with Overbeck and others to Asia Minor more particularly Ephesus.

[1] It has been said indeed that the *ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*, i. 14, might also be a spiritual seeing, an intuitive perception; but in the context of the prologue where the incarnation was mentioned as the means by which the knowledge and apprehension of the Divine Logos was made possible, the seeing of His glory (in the wonders of His omnipotence) can

described just before as standing by the cross (xix. 26), it is clear that the author, who appeals to the fact of his having been an eye-witness, refers to himself as this favourite disciple, in which character he already appears when mention is made of the disciple who lay on the Lord's breast at the last supper (xiii. 23). We must therefore look for the author in the circle of Jesus' three confidential friends (§ 46, 1); and since Peter is repeatedly named along with him (xiii. 24; xviii. 15 f.; xx. 2), and James who died early (Acts xii. 2) does not come into consideration, there remains only John, who in this indirect way describes himself as an eye-witness of the events related in the Gospel. He is also undoubtedly one of the two disciples of John who appear in the very beginning of the Gospel; one named, the other anonymous.[2] This indirect way of describing himself itself excludes all

only be mediated by it and must therefore be regarded as the seeing of His human, bodily life by eye-witnesses. In the same way the ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, xix. 35, has been interpreted as applying only to the eye-witness to whose testimony the author owes his knowledge, because in what follows (κἀκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει) he expressly distinguishes him from himself. But we see from ix. 37 that by ἐκεῖνος the speaker may likewise refer to himself; and here it must be taken in this sense, since the narrator could certainly vouch for the veracity of his witness but not for his *consciousness* of veracity (comp. Steitz, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1859, 2; 1861, and Buttmann, *ibid.*, 1860, 3; *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1862, 2). The fact that he speaks quite objectively of the signs which Jesus did in the presence of His disciples (xx. 30) cannot exclude himself from these μαθηταί, since he never speaks of himself in the first person.

[2] We must not however regard this indirect designation of himself as a mark of special modesty or delicacy on the part of the Evangelist, as Ewald and Meyer did, since it was the only form in which the author could bring himself into the history without interrupting the objectivity of the historical narrative in an unnatural way. On the other hand, when it has been said that a pupil of John's might certainly have described his master as the favourite disciple of the Lord, but not himself, an altogether false standard of modesty is applied, since we have here to do with a preference perceptibly given to him by Jesus by placing him at His side, which Peter takes for granted as well known (xiii. 24 f.), and which moreover Jesus substantially confirmed even on the cross by giving His mother into his charge (xix. 26 ff.). Whether it is

possibility of his having intended to give to his narrative of Christ merely the authority of an Apostle, for the fact that he does not openly give the name of his alleged authority is quite at variance with the naiveté of the pseudonymous authorship of antiquity. Renan has truly said that this way of suggesting the idea that his work proceeded from John (directly or indirectly) is not pseudonymous authorship, but simple (and certainly refined) deception. But the indirect testimony of the Gospel itself is confirmed by the appendix to it in a way that cannot be disputed. For the editors of the Gospel here affirm that the favourite disciple of whom this appendix treats (xxi. 7, 20), is the same who wrote the book (xxi. 24: *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα*) and attest the credibility of his testimony. This assertion has neither sense nor object, assuming that nameless men attest the genuineness of a pseudonymous production; it can only have been the authorities of the circle in which the Gospel first appeared who, from independent knowledge of the facts communicated in it, bear witness to their authenticity and to the circumstance of their having been recorded by the favourite disciple.[3]

in keeping with this, that the Evangelist, who so frequently names individual disciples, never mentions his brother James, and even describes his mother (comp. § 33, 1) only as the sister of the mother of Jesus (xix. 25), may be left undecided; as also whether it was because he himself was the other John, that he always speaks of the Baptist as John absolutely. In any case it was quite a mistake to suppose that the favourite disciple is introduced into the Gospel under the name of Nathanael (Spaeth, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1868, 80) whom others after the example of Holtzmann (Schenkel, *Bibellex.*, IV., 1872) even interpret as Paul (comp. O. L. and Heenig in *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1873, 1; 1884, 1).

[3] If, as Baur thought, the Evangelist only wished to intimate that he wrote in the spirit of the Apostle, since he was more concerned with the thing than with the person, he had then no reason for not directly naming his authority, or for implying by the way in which he spoke of him on every occasion as a participator, that his accounts, even if indirect, proceeded from him. But it was the more necessary for him to do this, since according to the critical conception, John was the bearer of a spirit quite

2. The Gospel was written for Greek-speaking Gentile Christians, as shown by the frequent explanation of Aramæan words and Jewish customs. This corresponds to the indisputable tradition that the Apostle John found his later sphere of action in the Churches of Asia Minor which were essentially Gentile Christian (§ 33, 2–4). For this reason also it was naturally written in Greek; but although it shows a certain facility and tact in handling the Greek language, implying a long sojourn in Greek surroundings, yet the linguistic type of the Palestinian, whose mother-tongue was Aramæan, is seen through the Greek dress on every occasion.[1] That his Old Testament citations should be

opposed to his, and no one could take the view of Jesus' life represented in our Gospel to be that of the Apostle unless he had been directly pointed to. The design attributed to the Gospel, of exalting this favourite disciple above Peter in the interest of a tendency is absolutely excluded by the fact that Jesus on first meeting the latter gives him the honorary name of Cephas, that here too Peter makes his great confession and is finally appointed to be even the chief shepherd of the Church (i. 42; vi. 68 f.; xxi. 15 ff.). If John comes to Jesus sooner than he, he is accompanied by Andrew (i. 35, 41), with regard to whom a tendency of this kind cannot be thought of; moreover the Acts (iii. 8) and even Luke xxii. 8 represent him as closely connected with Peter. The way in which Peter is led by him into the forecourt of the high priest is exempted from the suspicion of being intended to make him the more courageous by the manner in which it is accounted for (xviii. 15 f.); while the lively description of both going to the grave (xx. 4 ff.; comp. also xxi. 7) is by no means intended to indicate that he alone believed, or even that he believed before Peter, as shown by the reasons adduced and the consequence that directly follows (xx. 8 ff.).

[1] Compare the simple unperiodic construction, the monotonous combination of clauses by *καί*, *δέ*, *οὖν*, showing no knowledge of the rich Greek treasury of particles by which to indicate their logical relation, the Hebraistic phraseology, the circumstantiality and monotony of expression, the predilection for antitheses and parallelisms as also for the Hebraistic *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, the use of Aramæan words and names (*ῥαββί*, *ῥαββονί*, *κηφᾶς*, *μεσσίας*, *γαββαθᾶ*, *γολγοθᾶ*), especially the *ἀμήν ἀμήν* (comp. Delitzsch, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol.*, 1856), the explanation of *σιλωάμ* (ix. 7) and for further details on the subject, § 42, 6. Hence it is just as perverse to conceive of an Aramæan origin, with Grotius, Bolten and Bertholdt, as to doubt whether the Galilean fisherman, who owing to the linguistic relations of his home certainly understood the popular Greek language from the beginning, could have written a Greek work such as our Gospel.

taken preponderatingly from the LXX., which alone was known to his readers, is only natural; hence it is the more significant that he could only give the citations xiii. 18; xix. 37 in accordance with the primitive text, as also that the influence of this text is seen in vi. 45; xii. 15; and that the form of expression frequently follows the Old Testament without the mediation of the LXX. The author of the Gospel shows himself equally well acquainted with Palestinian localities. He knows the distance of Bethany from Jerusalem (xi. 18), the situation of the unimportant town of Ephraim (xi. 54) as well as that of Aenon entirely unknown to us (iii. 23); he expressly distinguishes Cana in Galilee from another place of the same name (ii. 1), and knows that from there to Capernaum is a descent (iv. 47). He is acquainted with Jacob's well as also with the traditions attaching to it (iv. 5, 12); he names particular places in Jerusalem (ix. 7; xix. 13) and in the temple (viii. 20; x. 22).[2] As a native of Palestine he invariably reckons according to Jewish time, which alone answers to all his dates; he knows and names the Jewish festival times and customs, even the time occupied in building the temple (ii. 20), the ritual practice regarding circumcision (vii. 22), the domestic customs at marriage and burial, and the relation between Jews and Samaritans (iv. 9; viii. 48). It is through him that in the Gospels we first learn the close relationship between Annas and Caiaphas (xviii. 13), the limits of the power of the Sanhedrim (xviii. 31) and the part which the Scribes with their conceit of learning and the Pharisees played

[2] It was the greater mistake to try to show that in this respect the Evangelist had made errors, such as the confounding of the Bethany in Perea with the one on the Mount of Olives; although x. 40 (comp. with xi. 6, 17 f.) shows most clearly how accurately he knew the distance between them; or the alleged misinterpretation of the name of the brook Cedron (xviii. 1), which can only be laid to the charge of the copyists. On the contrary the knowledge of Bethesda the house for the sick (v. 2) and of the more insignificant Sychar in addition to the better known Sichem (iv. 5) only proves his accurate knowledge of places.

in it; the priests with their Levitical attendants (i. 19), and the punishment of excommunication from the synagogue (ix. 22). In face of all this, the attempt to prove that when the Evangelist describes Caiaphas as high priest in the year of Christ's death (xi. 49–51; xviii. 13) he meant that the high priest was changed every year, cannot be taken seriously. Just as in the fourth Gospel we have the most vivid representation of the manifold forms of the popular expectation of the Messiah, so in it Jesus appears almost more prominently than even in the first as the fulfiller of direct as well as typical Messianic prophecy, who accomplishes in Israel first the salvation proceeding out of Israel, and notwithstanding the high aims He has in prospect for the future, presents the image of an Israelite faithful to the law in His earthly presence.[3] To the Evangelist also Israel is the peculiar people of the Logos, for whom salvation is first designed

[3] If Abraham already rejoiced in the Messiah and Moses wrote of Him (viii. 56; v. 46), and if the Scripture cannot be broken (x. 35), then x. 8 cannot be directed against Moses and the prophets, but only against those who at the time led the people astray, which is all that the expression can possibly mean. Just as salvation comes from the Jews (iv. 22) and the Baptist already represents the manifestation of the Messiah as destined for Israel (i. 31), so Jesus leaves Samaria after a short residence that was not of His own seeking, in order to concentrate His activity on His home (iv. 44); and only looks for His glorification in the Gentile world after His death (xii. 23 f.; comp. x. 16 f.); no mention is here made of a calling of the Gentiles or of sending disciples to them, though so frequent in the other Gospels. Jesus goes up to Jerusalem to the feasts oftener in this Gospel than in the rest, and begins by cleansing His Father's house (ii. 15 f.); worship in spirit and in truth certainly excludes worship at Jerusalem in the future, but expressly not in the present (iv. 21–23). He denounces the transgression of the law by the Jews, He argues on the assumption that circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath are equally binding (vii. 19, 22 f.), He alone, by His unique relation to the Father, being exalted above the latter (v. 17). Hence he can appeal only to the authority they also recognised, but has no desire to repudiate it for Himself, when He speaks of the law as their law (viii. 17; x. 34; xv. 25); while in the new ἐντολή which He gives (xiii. 34) He can only see the fulfilment of the will of God revealed by Him, as it appears in the earlier Gospels (comp. Matt. xxviii. 20 with v. 17).

(i. 11; xi. 51 f.), and Isaiah saw the glory of the Logos (xii. 41); but already he has before his eyes the historical fact that the Jews as such have rejected salvation and are the real representatives of unbelief and enmity to Jesus.[4] He speaks of the festivals and customs of the Jews in a way which shows that they had already become strange to him and his circle; but the law which was given by Moses (i. 17) is not on this account the less a Divine revelation like that manifested in Christ, although God's judgment on Jerusalem had already emancipated even believers in Israel from that law.

It would no doubt be impossible for the Gospel to proceed from a primitive Apostle, if it bore an anti-Jewish and antinomian character, even going far beyond Paul. But the semblance of the former could only arise if Jesus' polemic against hostile Judaism, assuming the unhistorical character of the Gospel, were explained merely as a mask under which the author gave expression to his opposition against Judaism as such (therefore Old Testament Judaism also); the semblance of the latter, if we overlook the fact that the actual emancipation of the Evangelist from the law has nothing in common with the essential principle of Paul's and is therefore by no means carried back into the history of Jesus. An attempt has been made to show the presence even of Gnostic ideas in our Gospel, in particular the dualism of two classes of men, one of which is destined for salvation and is therefore susceptible of salvation in Christ, the other by nature unsusceptible and hence shut out from it. But throughout the Gospel emphasis is laid on the universalism of the Divine intention to save, while the fundamental opposition which is certainly present in humanity and is only revealed and brought to a definite crisis by the appearance

[4] Hence it is quite a mistake to try to find a proof that the author cannot be a Jew, from the way in which the fourth Gospel speaks of the Ἰουδαῖοι (Fischer, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1840, 2), although Paul (1 Cor. ix. 20), Mark (vii. 3) and Matthew (xxviii. 15) do exactly the same thing. The very zeal with which he makes Jesus expose the ground and the guilt of their unbelief and hostility, shows the deep interest with which he follows up the judgment which the manifestation of Jesus had brought upon his people resulting in his mental separation from them. But the chief priest of this nation is still so high in his estimation in the time of Jesus, that he represents him as chosen to be the instrument of (unconscious) prophecy (xi. 51).

of Christ, is traced back to moral causes and personal responsibility, for which reason it allows a constant passing from one side to the other even in the region of actual empiricism (comp. Weiss, *Der johanneische Lehrbegriff*, Berlin, 1862). In recent times more importance has been attached to the Alexandrianism of the Gospel; and if the spread of the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy of religion to Asia Minor were more capable of proof than is actually the case, we see no reason why the Apostle John also should not have been influenced by it after his long residence there.[5] The real peculiarity of our Gospel is the mysticism common to it with the Johannine Epistles (§ 42, 4), but which, unless misinterpreted in a spiritualistic sense, is nowhere at variance with its Old Testament groundwork; on the contrary, though certainly accruing to the Apostle from the new knowledge he had found in Christ, it can only be rightly understood and estimated in its combination with his Old Testament fundamental views (comp. Weiss, *Johanneischer Lehrbegriff, Abschn.* 2, and especially Franke, *Das A. T. bei Johannes*, Göttingen, 1885); as appears in particular if the first Epistle of John, which is indissolubly connected with the Gospel in tradition as also by its kindred form and substance and in which the said mysticism is still more strongly prominent (§ 42, 4, 5), be regarded as a commentary upon it.

---

[5] As a matter of fact the revelation of God completed in Jesus does not in our Gospel exclude the living relation of God to the world; who from love to it sends the Son, Himself continuing to work without intermission, though frequently in and through the Son; who Himself draws men to the Son and gives them to Him; who makes His dwelling in believers and awakens the dead; who forms in short the most direct antithesis to Philo's lifeless conception of God resting on philosophic abstraction, a God who required the Logos as a medium for His world-agency. It is for this very reason that the personal, godlike, incarnate Logos of our Gospel is something so entirely different from the Logos of Philo which fluctuates between an hypostasis and the concept of the Divine powers, called δεύτερος θεός only by an abuse of the term and already bearing his name in an entirely different sense of the word (reason), a Logos whose cosmological dualism *à priori* excludes incarnation, so that there can be no idea of the Logos-conception or the Logos-speculation having been borrowed from him. The question as to whether the designation of the pre-existent son as the Logos is borrowed exclusively from the Old Testament (comp. Hoelemann, *de Evang. Joh. introitu*, Lips, 1855; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, § 145, *b*), or from the Targum, or is formed in relation to a terminology that had become current in his circle through the influence of the Alexandrian philosophy, thus loses all importance for the question respecting authenticity.

3. In the Gospel John still has the characteristics of the son of thunder, such as we know him from the earlier Gospels (§ 33, 1). The place of honour at the right of the Messianic throne, which in the ardour of youth he once desired (Mark x. 38), he has indeed found in the remembrance so fresh in the Gospel (No. 1), of the place Jesus accorded him on His breast (John xiii. 23). The intolerant anger in which his fiery love to his Master once found expression (Mark ix. 38; Luke ix. 45) is again reflected in the lofty idealism which everywhere sees the end in the beginning, the whole in the individual, the essence in the aspect, in whose view everything is split up into the sharpest antitheses between which it knows no medium (§ 42, 4), and which on this account has so frequently given rise to the semblance of a metaphysical dualism (No. 2). Hence it is that in this Gospel the earthly life of Christ appears as the great struggle of light with darkness; in which the apparent victory of unbelief becomes its judgment. In this respect, in spite of all the differences inherent in the nature of the subject, there is a real affinity with the Apocalypse which only represents the last phase of this struggle and the final judgment on the enemies of Christ. Even Baur recognised this affinity and called the Gospel the spiritualized Apocalypse,[1] but for this very reason agreed with all critics since Dionysius of Alexandria (comp. § 33, 3), in declaring it impossible for the author of the Gospel to have been the writer of the Apocalypse. Here indeed it

[1] Even the very criticism which declares the Gospel to be spurious, has to acknowledge this affinity, since the Gospel professes to be written by the Apostle John (No. 1) who was known in the Church as the seer of the Apocalypse, and therefore the author must have had some reason for connecting himself with the name of the Apocalyptist, and must have felt himself in some sort of relationship to him. If the Gospel be intended for an anti-Apocalypse (comp. Thoma, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1877, 3) it is impossible to understand how the author could be content to adopt the mask of the Apostle whom he desired to attack.

must not be overlooked that the Apocalypse is by these critics misinterpreted in a Judaistic and carnal sense (§ 35, 5); just as the Gospel is, in an anti-Jewish and spiritualistic sense.[2] The Apocalypse certainly pourtrays the Apostle as living much more fully in Old Testament views and has scarcely the least trace of the religious mysticism which pervades the Gospel as well as the Epistle (Apoc. iii. 20); but since the Epistle, which was probably written before the Gospel (§ 42, 5), refers us to the end of the century (§ 42, 7), a sufficient period certainly lies between the two writings to account for the author's change of ideas and expression. Least of all can it appear strange if the Apostle, who had passed more than two decades after the destruction of Jerusalem in Gentile-Christian surroundings, had assumed a different position with respect to the law of his fathers from that which the primitive Apostles originally held (No. 2). It has indeed been supposed that the way in which in the passover-dispute the Church of Asia Minor appealed to the Apostle John against the Roman Church, keeping the 14th Nisan with him on the basis of the Old Testament (comp. Euseb., *H.E.*, 5, 24), proves that the latter still adhered to the law in his ministry in Asia Minor. But according to 1 Cor. v. 7 f. Paul was already able to apprehend and interpret the observance of the Old Testament passover in the Christian spirit; and just because Jesus died on the 14th Nisan according to his

[2] It is a fact that the lofty Christology of the Apocalypse (§ 35, 6), which even gives to the returning Christ (though in another sense) the name ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (xix. 13), forms the first step to the Christological conceptions of the Gospel; that its figurative language is in many cases allied to the symbolical language of the discourses of Christ in the Gospel; and that even the diction of the Gospel, as well as that of the Epistle, with all its dissimilarity, also shows many points of resemblance (§ 42, 6). It is also noteworthy that the freedom with which the discourses and conversations are rendered (comp. No. 7) is very closely akin to the freedom with which the visions, and the voices heard in them, are given in the Apocalypse (§ 34, 2).

Gospel, it was natural for John to transform the old accustomed observance of this day into a specific Christian celebration, either on the ground that the passover-meal had been replaced by the institution of a solemn supper, or directly by the commemoration of Christ's death.

The Tübingen school supposed that because the fourth Gospel declares Jesus to be the true passover-lamb, and therefore makes Him die on the 14th Nisan, it cannot proceed from the Apostle John, to whom appeal was made on behalf of the observance of the passover in Asia Minor.[3] But it can by no means be proved that in celebrating the 14th Nisan by a supper, the Oriental observance originally rested on the fact that Jesus kept the passover meal with His disciples on the 14th Nisan and thus instituted the supper, as Keim, Mangold and Holtzmann still maintain in adherence to the Tübingen school. Such observance is therefore by no means at variance with the fourth Gospel, according to which Jesus kept the last meal with His disciples on the 13th, so that representatives of this view, such as Polycrates of Ephesus, are already familiar with the Gospel without finding it in opposition to this observance. At this opinion Gieseler and Hase, Lücke and Bleek have already with justice arrived (comp. also Schürer, *De Controversiis Paschalibus*, Lips., 1869). On the other hand Weitzel (*Die christliche Passahfeier der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, Pforzheim, 1848) and Steitz (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1856, 4; 57, 4; 59, 4, *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1861, 1) have sought to prove, in pursuance of a hint given by Neander, that the Oriental passover was originally a celebration of the day of Christ's death, which had its foundation in the fact that Jesus died on the 14th Nisan as represented in John's Gospel, and that the Judaizing Quartodecimans who appealed to legal prescription and to the example of

[3] The question whether the fourth Gospel really declares Jesus to be the true passover-lamb or not, is here quite immaterial. It is not at all probable, for i. 29 cannot by any means apply to the passover-lamb, and in xix. 36 a reference to Ps. xxxiv. 21 is on purely exegetical grounds (vid. Meyer-Weiss on the passage) at least considerably more probable than a reference to the ordinances respecting the passover-lamb. And since this typological idea by no means requires that Jesus should have died on the very day when the passover-lambs were slaughtered, it cannot be inferred from the fact that Jesus died on the 14th Nisan according to the fourth Gospel. Finally the chronological alterations which the Evangelist is said to have made for the purpose of carrying out that view, are inconceivable for the very reason that their meaning could not possibly have been intelligible to the Gentile Christians.

Christ, are entirely distinct from the common Church of Asia Minor. With them agree Jacobi, Ritschl, Lechler, Weizsäcker, and others side with them, while Hilgenfeld (comp. in particular *Der Passahstreit der alten Kirche*, Halle, 1860) and others have warmly contested the point. This dispute has at all events made it clear that however the question may be decided, the assertion of the Tübingen school that the position taken up by the Church of Asia Minor on the passover-question makes the composition of the fourth Gospel by the Apostle John impossible, is quite incapable of proof.

4. If the fourth Gospel was written towards the end of the first century, there is every probability in favour of the assumption that it implies a knowledge of our synoptical Gospels; nor is it by any means at variance with the view of its having originated with an eye-witness, that this eye-witness in his repetition of events already related by them or even of sayings preserved by them, should either voluntarily or involuntarily have followed the form in which such events were known to the Church by means of the older Gospels. A dependence of this kind can only indeed be directly proved in the case of Mark's Gospel; but an acquaintance with our Gospel of Matthew can scarcely be doubted. It is only with respect to Luke's that the proof cannot be carried through, for one of its sources shows so many points of contact with the specifically Johannine tradition (§ 48, 3, note 3), that even in cases where echoes might be due to literary attachment to Luke on the part of our Gospel, this explanation is possible. Neither of course can it be ascertained whether the author was acquainted with the Apostolic source, since we have it only in the form of a revision of our Gospels with which the Apostle was familiar.

Whereas Weisse disputes a knowledge of the older Gospels and Lücke declared that it was problematical, while de Wette and Bleek even maintained that on the contrary John's Gospel was used by Mark and Luke; such knowledge is now admitted by the advocates of the Johannine origin as well as by its opponents. Even Holtzmann still thinks of a Gospel allied to the synoptics, by means of which he tries to explain

many deviations from the synoptics as well as supplementary matter in them. The literary dependence on Mark is so obvious in v. 8 f. (Mark ii. 11 f.), vi. 7, 11, 19 f. (Mark vi. 37, 40, 49 f.), xii. 3, 5, 7 f. (Mark xiv. 3–6), xiii. 21 (Mark xiv. 18), not only in the agreement of natural traits but also in singularities of expression, that more trifling coincidences (ix. 6 *ἔπτυσεν*, comp. Mark viii. 23; xviii. 10 *ἔπαισεν-ὠτάριον*, comp. Mark xiv. 47; xviii. 18, 25 *θερμαινόμενος*, comp. Mark xiv. 54, 67; xviii. 22 *ῥάπισμα*, comp. Mark xiv. 65) acquire a higher significance.[1] We are reminded of our Gospel of Matthew by the citation from Zechariah in the narrative of the entry into Jerusalem (xii. 14 f.) and by that from Isaiah respecting the hardening of the people (xii. 39 f.), as also by a touch like xviii. 11 (comp. Matt. xxvi. 52); Luke is recalled mostly by the prominence given to the *right* ear in xviii. 10 and to the *two* angels at the grave in xx. 12 (comp. Luke xxii. 50; xxiv. 4). Whether sayings such as xii. 25; xiii. 20; xv. 20 (comp. the different application of it in xiii. 16) proceed from the Apostolic source, from our Gospels, or from the author's own recollection, it is impossible to say.[2]

Of still greater weight is the fact that the Evangelist

[1] From Mark, too, probably come reminiscences such as iv. 44; xiv. 31; xvi. 32, and above all the new turn given by Mark to the figure, in the words of the Baptist in i. 27, which in their beginning still show the original form retained by Matthew. On the other hand John xiii. 18 deviates from Mark xiv. 30 (comp. the corresponding feature in the narrative xviii. 27 in its distinction from Mark xiv. 71), because, as both the other synoptics show, the more simple form had here become as common in tradition as the form there given to the saying of the Baptist by Mark. So too he follows the later tradition in saying that the grave in which Jesus was laid was one that had not yet been used (xix. 41, comp. Matt. xxvii. 60; Luke xxiii. 53).

[2] According to this, all the points of contact with the synoptics which Holtzmann in his exaggerated way has collected (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1869), can prove nothing against the Gospel having proceeded from an eye-witness. If indeed Christ's discourses in the fourth Gospel were merely free revisions of synoptic pieces of discourse, as Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen*, etc., 1864) attempted to prove, then the Gospel could no longer proceed even from a Johannine disciple, who must have had independent traditions of his master at his disposal throughout (comp. on the other hand, Weiss, *Theol. Stud.*, 1866, 1). But in fact he has only proved that everywhere the same thoughts and motives for using imagery lie at the foundation of the Johannine discourses of Christ as at that of the synoptical ones; only the discourse in xv. 18–27 manifestly reproduces the same recollections as Matt. x. 17 ff., but without following the form of the words there.

not only knows the synoptic tradition himself, but also implies an acquaintance with it on the part of his readers. Without having told anything of the appearing or baptismal ministry of John, he bears testimony to him in i. 19; and yet his baptizing is incidentally implied as a well-known fact (i. 25 f.), just as the baptism of Jesus in i. 32 ff., of which nothing has been related, and the imprisonment of John in iii. 24. As Simon Peter is spoken of as a familiar personality before he appears in the history (i. 41 f.), so too mention is made of the Twelve and of their having been chosen (vi. 77, 70), without any previous account of it. We hear incidentally of the home of Jesus, of His mother, His brethren and His father (i. 46; ii. 1–12; vi. 42), without anything preliminary to these statements having been told by the narrator. He transfers us to the midst of Jesus' Galilean activity (vi. 1 f.), of which, though giving a hint of its beginning (iv. 43 ff.), he has practically told nothing. The narrator assumes an acquaintance with the sisters Mary and Martha as well as with the story of the anointing before he has related it (xi. 1 f.). He passes over the proceedings before Caiaphas, although he points to them (xviii. 24, 28), and only indicates by Pilate's question, what the Jews had accused Jesus of (xviii. 33). But where he touches upon the synoptic tradition, he displays throughout a knowledge of details far surpassing that of our Gospels, just as he shows a recollection of the minutest particulars where his narrative is independent.[3]

[3] He knows the place where the Baptist first appeared and the immediate occasion of the Baptist's saying recorded in the synoptics (i. 19–28), he knows the native town of Philip and of the sons of Jonas (i 46) and is aware that the father of Judas was called Simon Iscariot (vi. 71); in the story of the feeding he names the two disciples with whom Jesus immediately acts, and the way in which they had come by their small provision (vi. 5–9); he knows how far the disciples thought they had proceeded on the sea when Jesus appeared to them (vi. 19); he knows the part played by Mary, Martha and Judas in the history of the anointing (xii. 2 ff.) as by Peter at the arrest; even

The more we inquire critically into the conditions under which our older Gospels originated, the clearer it becomes that the fourth Gospel could not possibly proceed from an eye-witness without containing an abundance of material which he had added from his own recollection to what was there treated of. To what extent it contains such additions needs no proof. In like manner it is inconceivable that he should not have found much to be corrected in the view taken by Mark's Gospel of particular events, for Mark after all is only a secondary source; and in fact many a circumstance is thus by the help of the account in the fourth Gospel made intelligible to us for the first time. Above all, the whole historical framework of the synoptics rests on Mark, who was not an eye-witness himself and could not give a pragmatic account of the history of Jesus nor professed to do so, but endeavoured to sketch a picture of its development, from the fragmentary traditions which, in the nature of things, first begin where his authority entered into constant companionship with Jesus; a picture therefore whose individual features can after all only represent *his* view of the history (§ 46). If the fourth Gospel betrayed a dependence on this plan, it could not proceed from an eye-witness. But when the Evangelist in one passage at least (iii. 24) and probably

the name of the high priest's servant is known to him (xviii. 10). He knows why it was Joseph of Arimathæa who gave his grave for the disposal of the body of Jesus (xix. 41 f.). So too he has a most accurate remembrance of the day and hour of his first acquaintance with Jesus (i. 29, 35, 40), he names the hour at Jacob's well and the hour when the nobleman's son was healed (iv. 6, 52). He knows the connection of Jesus with Cana (ii. 1; iv. 46) and first gives us the key to the relation between him and his brethren, incidentally mentioned also in the earlier Gospels (vii. 5). He names the place where John afterwards baptized (iii. 23), and still accurately remembers the place (vi. 59; viii. 20) and time (vii. 37; x. 22) of many of Jesus' most important speeches (comp. also xvi. 4). He knows of Jesus' return to Bethany in Perea and to Ephraim (x. 40; xi. 54); and describes the place and hour where Pilate gave his definite decision (xix. 13 f.).

more often (comp. xii. 1; xiii. 1; xvi. 4) expressly opposes an idea which has gained currency on the basis of early tradition, he must be conscious of knowing and understanding things better from his own independent knowledge, and assume that his readers take this for granted, *i.e.* he must have been an eye-witness. In truth all unbiassed criticism teaches that in every important point in which he deviates, he has historical probability in his favour, as also in most cases the evidence of those facts which the older tradition has preserved, without overlooking their consequences.

The Schleiermacher-de Wette criticism in its predilection for the fourth Gospel sacrifices to it without examination the tradition that is more than two decades earlier; but it is no less onesided for later criticism to accuse the account of the fourth Gospel of misinterpretation in the interest of a tendency, wherever it deviates from Mark, as if the chronological and pragmatic combinations of Mark were unconditionally trustworthy. The testimony of the Baptist which declares Jesus to be the Messiah, is not in contradiction with the synoptic account, but is obviously confirmed by Matt. xi. 6. The description of the first acquaintance of John, Andrew and Simon with Jesus, which enabled them to see God's chosen One in Him, first makes the synoptical history of the calling altogether intelligible from a psychological point of view, and is only at variance with Mark's erroneous conception of the significance of Peter's confession, a view justly abandoned even by his revisers (chap. i.). Jesus' repeated journeys to festivals and the consequent extension of His labours to two years at least are likewise required by many indications in the synoptic tradition; and just as it is clear why it was necessary for this tradition, in accordance with the scheme on which it was based, to transfer the cleansing of the temple to the passover immediately connected with his death, so it manifestly acquires its true meaning for the first time when Jesus made it the opening of His ministry (chap. ii.). His return to the work of baptizing in Judea (chap. iii.), quite inconceivable as fiction, explains simply enough why nothing respecting the whole of this period passed into tradition! His contact with the Samaritans (chap. iv.) throws new light on many features of the Gospels as well as of the Acts. His breach with the hierarchy in Jerusalem, so clearly accounted for (chap. v.), first explains the attention bestowed on the Galilean Messiah, even according to the synoptics, by the metropolitan authorities. The attempt of the people, after the feeding, to proclaim Him the Messianic king is certainly opposed to the

idea historically impossible in itself and which cannot be explained from the synoptic account, that the people first recognised and proclaimed Him as the Messiah on the occasion of his entry into Jerusalem among palms; but it is the only key to Jesus' abandonment of His ministry to the people, which took place according to the synoptics in the later time of His Galilean labours; the apostasy of the people in consequence of their being undeceived first teaches us to understand the true meaning of Peter's confession and of the predictions of Jesus concerning His passion which were now beginning, just as it prepares us for the change in Judas (chap. vi.). The long activity of Jesus in the capital, with its varying results (chap. vii.–x.) only prepares us in reality for the catastrophe which takes place without any specified cause in the synoptical Gospels. The anointing in Bethany, brought about by the raising of Lazarus, here for the first time receives its true chronological position, as opposed to the false appearance due to the fact that Mark assigns it a place purely in accordance with its subject; the narrative of the entrance into Jerusalem, which is simply incomprehensible as told by the synoptics, only here finds intelligible explanation (chap. xii.). Not only is all historical probability in favour of the assumption that Jesus celebrated the last meal with His disciples on the 13th Nisan and was therefore crucified on the 14th; but the synoptics, who regard it as a legal passover-meal, have themselves preserved a number of traits directly opposed to such a view. The object and connection shown in Jesus' allusion to His betrayer, quite unintelligible in Mark, first receive their explanation in John (chap. xiii.), as also the story of the denial, which our Gospel first puts in its right place and time because it has retained the hearing before Annas (chap. xviii.). The conduct of Pilate becomes intelligible by his examination of Jesus, related in this Gospel alone; the strange inscription on the cross being explained by what took place on that occasion (xix. 19–22). Comp. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, 2 Aufl., Berlin, 1884.

5. In the prologue with which the Gospel opens (i. 1–18), the Evangelist himself explains the points of view from which he desires the following history to be considered. The eternal, Godlike Logos, the mediator of all life and all light from the beginning, became flesh in Jesus Christ. But whereas the world in general, represented first and foremost by His peculiar people, did not receive Him, believers by seeing His glory attained to the more and more abounding grace of a full knowledge of God and thus to the highest privilege of sonship to God. The question therefore turns

on his self-revelation and its reception. The *first* part therefore describes Jesus' introduction to the world by the testimony of the Baptist and by His revelation of Himself in the circle of His first believers (i. 19–ii. 13). To the Jews, whose official representatives interrogate him as to who he might be, John confesses that he prepares the way for a greater than himself who comes after him and already stands unrecognised in their midst, (i. 19–28); to his disciples he confesses that Jesus is the Lamb of God and had been before him, whom he recognised as the Messiah because he had seen the Spirit descending upon Him (i. 29–34). Jesus by what He says to Simon reveals Himself as knowing all hearts (i. 35–43) and speaks a word of Divine omniscience to Nathanael (i. 44–52), while He manifests His Divine glory to His disciples at the marriage at Cana by His first omnipotent miracle (ii. 1–12).[1] It is only in the *second* part at the passover-feast in Jerusalem, that Jesus begins His public ministry with the cleansing of the temple (ii. 13–22); and this part describes how in the progress of His self-revelation He seeks to raise the belief in miracles which meets Him at first, to faith in His word (iv. 43–54). So in

[1] Certain as it is that the two testimonies of the Baptist are selected as important, yet the enumeration of the time shows that they remain so indelibly fixed in the memory of the Evangelist because they immediately preceded the memorable day on which he himself came into relation with Jesus. The particular account of this meeting, entirely without importance in itself, is only explained by the personal interest which attaches to it for the narrator, as also the notice of Jesus' first visit to Capernaum, with which the section closes (comp. also the scene in xix. 25 ff.). The account of Philip coming in between the two significant sayings of Jesus is only explained on the supposition of a definite remembrance of the fact that Jesus came into contact with Nathanael through him; and the way in which the latter is introduced, without his being identified with any of the disciples known from older tradition, is in favour of independent knowledge on the part of the Evangelist, whose communications concerning the appearance of Jesus at the marriage in Cana still precede His entrance on His public ministry.

Jerusalem, where this is seen in His conversation with Nicodemus (ii. 23–iii. 21); so in Samaria, where His revelation of Himself to a sinful woman at once awakens a readiness to believe, on which account He leaves the rich future harvest in that place to His disciples, in order to begin the work of a sower in His own home (iv. 1–42); so in Galilee, where He leads the nobleman's son from belief in a miracle to faith in His word (iv. 43–54). How little even this part is composed merely in accordance with a model (comp. note 1), is shown by the way in which the account of Jesus' baptizing in Judea, unimportant in itself, is inserted in the narrative, serving only as a means for the communication of an additional testimony to Him as the Messiah on the part of the Baptist (iii. 22–36). The *third* part leads directly to the crisis which His self-revelation calls forth. In Judea the unbelief with which it is met immediately turns to deadly enmity (chap. v.); in Galilee, when the wonder-seeking multitude are undeceived, their half-belief changes into unbelief; only the small number of the Twelve remaining faithful to Him, with one exception (chap. vi.). In this part Samaria can no longer come under consideration, because Jesus, after His first experience there, gave up a Samaritan ministry on principle. In like manner Galilee disappears from the history after the crisis which took place there; for Judea still remains the actual chief seat of unbelief in Jesus; hence it is here that the last struggle with it must be fought out. The *fourth* part (chap. vii.–x.) shows Jesus still victorious in this struggle, because His hour had not yet come. The introduction relates how for His part He kept out of the way of it as long as He dared (vii. 1–13). When therefore at the feast of tabernacles the chief priest sought for the first time to arrest Him, the attempt turned out a miserable failure (vii. 14–52).[2] Equally

[2] The section respecting the woman taken in adultery (vii. 53–viii. 11) according to the testimony of the oldest codd. and according to the

vain is the attempt, when it proves impossible to succeed in arresting Him, to make the populace stone Him in their anger (viii. 12–59). So too the attempt to intimidate His followers by threatening them with excommunication from the synagogue, shown in the history of the man who was born blind, fails, and only draws down on the chief priests the sharper condemnation of Jesus, who already looks forward with definite prescience to His death (ix. 1–x. 21). The struggle culminates in the excited scene at the feast of the Dedication, where Jesus although He again escapes their twofold attack ultimately finds Himself compelled to avoid further struggles by retreating to Perea (x. 22–42). The *fifth* part brings the completion of Jesus' self-revelation in the raising up of Lazarus, which on this account provokes His opponents to resolve finally on His death chap. xi., before the people in the Messianic triumphal procession, which is only fully explained by its connection with the history of the anointing, and in the scene with the Greeks (xii. 1–36); after which the Evangelist concludes the history of His public ministry with a backward glance at its results (xii. 37–50). It is only now that he turns to the completion of this self-revelation in the sight of believers, in the history of the last meal, which he characterizes by its superscription (xiii. 1) as a love-feast, and to which the farewell discourses and the farewell prayer are attached (chap. xiii.–xvii.). The apparent victory of unbelief culminating in enmity to Jesus is then described in the history of the

more synoptical character of its language and presentment, does not belong to the text of the Gospel; although it was early introduced as an unsuccessful attack on Jesus and perhaps as an illustration of viii. 15 f., it is foreign to the plan followed in the connection of the section and evidently belongs to Jesus' last stay in Jerusalem. It is even given up by expositors like Hengstenberg, Luthardt and Godet; and apart from Ebrard and Lange, is only now defended by those who dispute the authenticity of the Gospel, such as Bretschneider, Strauss, Bruno Bauer, by Hilgenfeld in particular and others.

passion, which is intended in the first section to show how the prediction respecting Judas and Peter is fulfilled (chap. xviii. 1–27), and therefore dwells exclusively on the history of the arrest and the occurrences in the palace of Annas; in the second, how in spite of all delay and resistance on the part of Pilate, Jesus' saying with regard to His crucifixion (xviii. 32) must necessarily be fulfilled (xviii. 28–xix. 16); in the third, how His very death on the cross was the most glorious confirmation of His Messiahship (xix. 20, 24, 28; 36 f.; xix. 17–42). The *sixth* part then relates three appearances of the Risen One, the last of which sets forth the completeness of faith in Him as the Divine Lord (xx. 28); whereupon the Gospel concludes with a declaration of its purpose (xx. 30 f.).[3]

Formerly the Gospel was for the most part divided in accordance with geographical or chronological views, the three feast-journeys being

[3] From this it already follows that chap. xxi. can only be an appendix. But since vers. 22 f. clearly shows that it is intended to correct a misunderstanding of a saying of Jesus, whose current acceptation was only proved erroneous after the Apostle's death, and since ver. 24 evidently speaks of the author of the Gospel as another person (comp. also the mention of the sons of Zebedee in ver. 2); this concluding chapter can only have been added by another hand after the death of the Apostle, even if the fact that it rests on Johannine tradition prevents it showing any essential deviations from the Johannine language and mode of presentment, and must have been already added at the time of its publication, because the Gospel never appears without it (comp. No. 1). Many of those who defend it as belonging to the Gospel, have pronounced vers. 24 f. at least to be the addition of a foreign hand (comp. Luthardt, Ebrard, Godet and Keil); whereas Weitzel (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849), Lange, Hengstenberg and in the interest of the spuriousness of the Gospel Bretschneider, Hilgenfeld, Hönig, Thoma and Jacobsen regard the whole chapter as belonging to the Gospel. On the other hand its composition by the Apostle was already disputed by Grotius and Clericus, its spurious character having been proved in detail by Seyffarth (*Beiträge zur Spezialcharakteristik der Johanneischen Schriften*, Leipz., 1823) and Wieseler (*Dissert.* von 1839, comp. § 46, 5, Note 6) and acknowledged even by Baur and most of the adherents of the Tübingen school (Schwegler, Zeller, Köstlin, Keim, Scholten and Holtzmann).

specially taken into account (comp. Olshausen). Since Lücke and de Wette chief importance has been attached to the section formed by the reflections contained in xii. 37–50, although it only concludes Jesus' ministry to the people, while the point of view of the completion of Jesus' self-revelation is certainly common to chaps. xi., xii. *and* chaps. xiii.–xvii. It was Baur who first tried to divide the Gospel according to the fundamental ideas it contains, since which time its thoughtful composition has been recognised on all sides, except that the points of view by which it is dominated are in many cases drawn out in too artificial and arbitrary a way; while Keim, Holtzmann, Hengstenberg and others find a play of numbers in the arrangement and contents of the separate parts which is quite foreign to the Evangelist. There is also a general agreement with regard to the chief individual groups; and the question whether they should be ranged in two or three, five or seven leading parts is in truth a matter of comparative indifference. In addition to the Commentaries compare more particularly Hönig (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1871, 1883, 84), Holtzmann (*ibid.*, 1881) and lastly Franke, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1884, 1, who gives an excellent survey and criticism of the different attempts at classification.

6. That the fourth Gospel does not properly aim at historiography, appears from the circumstance that it assumes a knowledge on the part of the readers of the Evangelical history in general, as well as of many individual details (No. 4). The fact that we are told nothing of the actual ministry of the Baptist, but only of certain testimonies on his part, and that the feeding of the multitude is the only event, apart from the first miracle, recorded of the whole Galilean ministry so minutely treated in the Gospels with which he was familiar, of which ministry it forms the crisis, as also that the proceedings before Caiaphas are entirely passed over in the history of the passion, though expressly hinted at (xviii. 24, 28), shows indisputably that it was not his aim to relate all that he knew, as is expressly stated with regard to the σημεῖα (xx. 30). The above analysis of the contents (No. 5) makes it sufficiently clear that certain events are chosen throughout in order to illustrate by and in them the chief points of view which were important to the Evangelist. Hence it was quite a mistake to

suppose that he meant to exclude what he does not expressly relate, as not happening, because it was not in keeping with his view of Christ.[1] Just as little can the eclectic procedure of the Evangelist be explained by assuming that he intended to supplement the synoptic account.[2] This is directly contradicted by the assertion of the Apostle, according to which the object of his choice of narratives is the confirmation of faith in the Messiahship of Jesus in his sense, *i.e.* in His eternal Sonship to God, which leads to

[1] Now he is said to exclude the history of the birth, in particular the miraculous conception, now the baptism and temptation of Jesus, now the transfiguration and the prayer in Gethsemane, although these were universally known to the readers through the familiar synoptic tradition; and again the institution of the last supper whose memory was kept alive by the constant practice of the Church. But he has also passed over the healing of the lepers and the casting out of devils, the intercourse of Jesus with publicans and sinners, the legal disputes with the Pharisees and the parables of the kingdom of God, the detailed utterances of Jesus respecting the righteousness of the kingdom of God and the position towards earthly possessions, as also respecting the manifold duties of discipleship, predictions of the catastrophe in Judea and of the manner of His second coming, not to speak of much for the omission of which no critical ingenuity can find a reason. It could never occur to any reader, that all not here related of the wellknown events of Jesus' life, did not happen. Hence it is quite inconceivable that because the Evangelist gave the preference to events occurring in Judea, in accordance with his plan (No. 5), he intended to characterise Judea as the true scene of the work of Jesus in opposition to the earlier Gospels; though he makes Jesus return repeatedly to Galilee (i. 44; iv. 3, 43), and in vi. 2; vii. 1 implies a continuous ministry in Galilee, while in vii. 41, 52 Jesus expressly appears as the Galilean prophet.

[2] This view is again adopted by Ebrard and Godet after the example of Eusebius (*H. E.*, 3, 24) and Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 9) Michaelis and Hug, but also by Ewald and Beyschlag. It was only natural that an eyewitness should prefer to dwell on such recollections as had not been put forward in the earlier Gospels; but to assume that the Gospel had the aim above stated would necessarily imply that the biographical point of view was actually the leading one; besides which there are far too many express points of attachment to the earlier narrative, especially in the history of the passion, all of which can by no means be shown to be indispensable to his account (comp. *ex. gr.* the histories of the anointing and of the entry into Jerusalem), to admit of such a view.

perfect blessedness (xx. 30 f.). This doctrinal aim certainly implies that he believed faith in the Son of God or the incarnate Logos to be endangered or needing confirmation in his circle; and the Epistle so closely connected with the Gospel shows that it was Cerinthian Gnosis to which this was due (§ 42, 2). For this reason it is impossible to speak of the Gospel having either a polemic or an apologetic tendency, or to explain the choice or presentment of material in this way.[3] The danger threatening the true faith in emerging Gnosis can alone have been the occasion which prompted him in presenting and illustrating the leading particulars in the life of Jesus, to make his own testimony as an eye-witness (i. 14) the basis of proof that the Divine glory of the incarnate Logos had appeared in Christ, and in victorious struggle with the unbelieving world had brought the highest blessedness to all believers. It is undoubtedly for this purpose that reference is constantly made to words

[3] In assuming that the Gospel specially attacked the Gnostics, the Ebionites, or as Irenæus already maintained, Cerinthian Gnosis (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 11, 1), the Church Fathers only expressed their conviction that these errors were refuted by the Gospel; but their opinion is without value as regards the determination of its historical aim. Nevertheless it has again and again been regarded as an attack either on Docetism (comp. Niemeyer, *De Docetis*, Halle, 1823) or on Ebionism (comp. Lange, *Die Judenchristen, Ebioniten*, etc., Leipz., 1828), or on both, as by Ebrard; or rather as a defence of the true faith opposed to these errors, as by de Wette, Hengstenberg and others. Passages such as i. 14; xix. 34; xx. 20, 27 are at one time said to present an antagonism to Docetism, while again other things are said to be omitted lest they should foster these doctrinal errors. It has even been conjectured on the ground of passages such as i. 6 ff., 15, 19 ff.; iii. 22 ff., after the example of Grotius, that the Gospel was specially designed as an attack on the so-called Johannine disciples (comp. Overbeck, *über das Evangelium Johannes*, 1784, as also Ewald and Godet); while Aberle (*Tübing. Quartalschr.*, 1864, 1) finds here too a defence against the insinuating propaganda of re-established Judaism, in particular against the intrigues of the Jews at Jabne (comp. on the other hand Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1865, 1), as Lücke against the objections of the Gentile and Jewish κόσμος; all which do equally little justice to the systematic unity of the Gospel.

of Divine omniscience spoken by Jesus, and that a number of great omnipotent miracles are represented as visible signs of this Divine majesty; but that the form of Christ in the Gospel is not by such means made a Docetic one is already seen in the fact that this glory appears far more prominently than in the synoptics as a thing conferred upon Him; miracles being represented as asked of God and performed by His miraculous help.[4] A predilection indeed is shown for the discourses in which He triumphantly asserts His heavenly origin and the saving significance of His coming, in opposition to the doubts and objections of unbelief; while the dispute as to the relations of the time and the exhortation respecting the manifold relations of life recede entirely into the background (comp. Note 1); but to maintain that these are mere expositions of the doctrine of the Logos is

[4] It is certainly characteristic of the eclectic manner of our Evangelist, that he does not pourtray the healing ministry of Jesus but describes at great length a limited number of miracles of healing most of which are marked with importance; but to say that the healing of the nobleman's son is depicted as more wonderful because Jesus was not yet in Capernaum but in Cana, or the healing of the lame man because he had already lain sick for thirty-eight years, is quite absurd; while even the facts that the blind man, at whose healing Jesus made use of external means just as in Mark, was born blind, and that Lazarus had already lain in the grave for three days, lose all significance as soon as we reflect that the healing of the blind and the raising from the dead are also undoubtedly regarded by the synoptics as miracles in an absolute sense. The changing of the water into wine in Cana is no greater miracle than the multiplying of the bread at the feeding of the multitude, common to the Evangelist with the synoptics. The walking on the sea is unique in both; only that in the synoptics it is preceded by the stilling of the storm. In the synoptics too Jesus appears as one who knows the heart and who likewise gives occasional proof of superhuman foreknowledge; but even in John Jesus asks questions (ix. 35; xi. 34; xviii. 34) and does not invariably possess Divine omniscience. On the contrary all that He says and does is given by God (v. 19 f., 30; viii. 28; xii. 49 f.; xiv. 10), He receives in answer to prayer (xi. 41 f.) Divine miraculous help (xi. 52) and Divine miraculous protection (viii. 29); God gives Him the Spirit but without measure (iii. 34), and to Him Jesus owes all His success.

only possible if they are misinterpreted in the old dogmatic way. Even if narratives such as the history of the temptation, the prayer in Gethsemane or the cry of lamentation on the cross found no place in an historical account intended to set forth the Divine glory of the Incarnate, yet the fourth Gospel shows much more forcibly than the earlier ones the real human participation of Jesus in joy and sorrow, in human feelings and agitations of mind, and refers His sinlessness to the victory over self-will and ambition, to obedience and love to God, qualities which earn the good pleasure of God and are typical for mankind.[5] Hence the doctrinal tendency of the Gospel is not to be understood in the sense that a higher idea of the person of Christ is made prominent by narratives of His life, thus making the history the mere representative of an idea. On the contrary, as is alone in keeping with its historical occasion and the strong emphasizing of the personal experience of an eye-witness, the object is to prove in opposition to a Gnosis which resolves living faith in Christ into empty

[5] What the prologue intimates as to the creation of the world and all illumination being mediated through the Logos (i. 3 f.), never recurs in the discourses of Christ; what they teach respecting His oneness with the Father, His being in the Father and the Father in Him, and the seeing of the Father in Him, contains no declaration of a Divine nature in the metaphysical sense, but only confirms the perfect revelation of God manifested in Him. He speaks of the only true God (xvii. 3) as His God (xx. 17), who is greater than He (xiv. 28), whose glory He alone seeks (vii. 18), whom He honours (viii. 49) and worships (chap. xvii.), whose will He performs out of love to Him (xiv. 31; xv. 10). In truth His discourses by no means tend to the glorification of His person, but show that by virtue of the loving counsel of God accomplished in His mission, full salvation for time and eternity is given by faith in Him. A man who is tired (iv. 6) and thirsty (xix. 28), who sheds tears at the grave of a friend (xi. 35), who speaks of His peace and His joy (xiv. 27; xv. 11), of whom we are told that He was troubled in spirit (xii. 27; xiii. 21) and that He chafed (xi. 33, 38), is not merely a God going about in a human frame, whose history is invented only in order to demonstrate the incarnation of the Logos; and the assertion that this view is only not carried out, is an empty pretext.

speculations, how it is only by looking at the perfect revelation of God in the facts of the human life of Jesus, that faith finds full blessedness. In this way alone is it possible to explain the peculiar fusion of an historical account which only takes up and illustrates certain chosen prominent facts in their deepest meaning, with loving absorption in the minutest details and personal recollections of the most trifling kind extending even to the correction of mistaken ideas of the external framework of the history (No. 4), such as characterize our Gospel. A representation of this kind, if estimated according to its value as an historical source, which it neither is nor pretends to be, may show deficiencies; but it will never answer to reduce its materials to purely ideal forms.

7. Owing to the distance between the events and the time at which the Evangelist wrote of them, a verbal repetition of long discourses and dialogues is naturally out of the question.[1] In truth, all that can be said is that the author sought to reconstruct them from fragmentary recollections. In not a few cases he has evidently only interwoven these recollections in an exposition of Jesus' leading points of view projected according to his own plan (comp. especially chap. v.); and in so doing has also joined together, on account of their similarity of subject, utterances of Jesus that were separated in time; a proceeding in which he was anticipated by the first Evangelist (comp. chap. vi. 14–16). Just as certain as it is that the misunderstandings into which the conversations are drawn out, said to be so incomprehensible, are vindicated as historical by exactly similar ones in the synoptics (comp. Mark viii. 16; Luke xxii. 38),

[1] It is an utterly untenable hypothesis, to have recourse to earlier records or even to protocols of the synagogue and temple (comp. Bertholdt, *Paulus*). To say that the Evangelist must often enough have heard these discourses orally repeated before he wrote them down, does not exclude the assumption that the form of their rendering gradually became freer and freer as recollection became less accurate.

so certain is it that in many cases they may only in point of fact be attempts of the Evangelist to illustrate the progress of the discussion; such as we already find in Luke. Just as certainly as the synoptic discourses of Jesus are neither devoid of paradox (Matt. viii. 22; Mark x. 25) nor of apparent contradictions (Luke ix. 50; xi. 23, comp. with John v. 31; viii. 14, or iii. 17; ix. 39), such as are called forth by the gnomologic pointing of the discourse, so certainly may the increase of paradox here and there, alleged to be frequently without motive or instruction, be due to the fact that it was only the climaxes of the discourse that remained in the author's memory. The separate gnomes recur in different forms and with different applications, just as in the synoptics (comp. xiii. 16; xv. 20); so that it is by no means certain that John has always employed the gnomes familiar from the synoptics, in their original connection. The fact that xvi. 25 expresses a clear consciousness that the words of Jesus were essentially figurative, is itself an intimation that where they pass into abstract reflection or more detailed expansion, it is due to the explanatory elucidation of the Evangelist. On the other hand the parabolic speaking of Jesus which is already mixed with allegorical features and allegorizing explanation in the synoptics, is here so overladen with both that it is scarcely recognisable in its true character.[2] That the Evangelist

[2] The gnomologic character of Jesus' discourse (comp. iv. 37; viii. 34; xvi. 16) and His figurative language is the same in John as in the synoptics. We have the same circle of homely symbols drawn from bodily life, as well as from the life of nature and the family; life and death, seeing and blindness, hunger and thirst (from which the symbolism of bread and water, parallel with that of salt and leaven in the synoptics, follows of itself), light and darkness, seedtime and harvest, shepherd and sheep, master and servant, father and child, house and cup, some of which may be used in preference to others and with wider embellishment. Nor is there any lack of parabolic sayings which have quite the synoptic character (iii. 8; xii. 24; xvi. 21); but just as figure and interpretation are in viii. 35 mixed up in one of these, so the two

is fully conscious of not giving a verbal rendering of the discourses and conversations is shown by the very frequent references to former words existing only in wording essentially different (i. 30; vi. 36, 65; xi. 40), or to words and facts belonging to a connection entirely remote (vi. 68; vii. 19, 21; x. 26); and even to words which in their framing are evidently connected with words of the Evangelist (vi. 67; viii. 28) or in which Christ is spoken of in the third person (xvii. 3). This appears still more clearly where the discourse of Jesus passes directly into the Evangelist's explanation (iii. 19 ff.), or where the Evangelist, taking up the substance of Jesus' words spins it out into reflections of his own (xii. 44–50). Owing to this free, explanatory and elucidatory rendering of the words of Jesus, for which moreover there is no lack of precedent in the synoptical discourses of Christ, it cannot be matter of surprise that the discourses of Christ in the fourth Gospel exhibit the linguistic and doctrinal character of the Evangelist throughout, as he is known to us from his Epistle.[3] Hence it is that not only the original wording, but also the concrete historical references of the words of Jesus are often effaced, because the Evangelist in his conception of the person of Christ is only concerned with their permanent significance and edifying worth.[4] It was the very Apostle who was

parables drawn from shepherd-life and from the vine (chap. x., xv.) are abundantly interwoven with allegorising interpretations, though without their original form becoming quite unrecognisable.

[3] It is vain to appeal to the presumption that the favourite disciple who entered most deeply into the spirit of his master, would also have formed his manner of speech most closely in accordance with that of the Master; for in proportion as his discourses of Christ bear a Johannine character do they differ also in form from the synoptic ones, which in accordance with their origin as well as all historical probability bear the stamp of authenticity; besides, the same Johannine character is also impressed on the discourses of the Baptist and of other persons speaking in the Gospel.

[4] Because the Apostle in conformity with the aim of the Gospel is

conscious of having received his entire spiritual life from Christ and also of having learnt to understand the true meaning of Christ only in those deeper experiences revealed to him by the illumination of the Spirit (xvi. 13 f.), who could thus freely reproduce discourses of Christ which he could not possibly render verbally, without fear of mixing them with foreign matter.[5] That which holds good where the reproduction of the discourses is concerned, also holds good to a certain extent with regard to the narrative part of the Gospel. It certainly shows no lack of the most vivid

only concerned with the salvation which the individual finds in faith in Christ, the discourse respecting the kingdom of God almost invariably turns into discourses on the highest blessing of salvation the individual finds in Him, viz. eternal life, which, like the kingdom of God, appears at one time as present and again as future, and has received its specific Johannine stamp in the conception of an intuitional knowledge of God and of mystical communion of life with Christ as its essence. Just as the Apostle's view of the saving significance of Jesus' death and of His pre-existence is put into the words of the Baptist (i. 29 f.), the latter being inextricably interwoven with the wholly different views of the Baptist (iii. 31–36); so in the discourses of Christ side by side with certain enigmatical intimations which bear the stamp of originality throughout, the Apostle's views of the origin of Jesus from a primeval existence and of God being seen in Him, as also his mystical conception of the relation between Father and Son, are expressed with a dogmatic precision which compels us of necessity to separate the original words of Christ from their Johannine revision and interpretation.

[5] Nevertheless various traces show that the Evangelist was by no means dead to all distinction between his exact recollections of the words of Jesus and his theology that had grown out of them; for many doctrinal views are found in the prologue and the Epistle which have not passed into the discourses of Christ; and there are many ideas in the latter which John has never turned to account as doctrine (comp. § 42, 5, note 3). The Evangelist repeatedly distinguishes between his interpretation and the words of Jesus (comp. vii. 38 f.), even where the wording is still retained (xii. 32 f.) or the connection (xviii. 9, comp. xvii. 12) makes such interpretation quite impossible; or where he expressly states that it was only revealed to the disciples afterwards (ii. 22). The passage xiv. 26 certainly testifies to a consciousness on the part of the Apostle that recollections came back to him even of sayings of Jesus which had not passed over into earlier tradition; and unquestionably he still preserved an abundance of such recollections, which his hand left untouched.

and minute recollection, such as generally comes up with great freshness in advanced age. It follows from the whole plan of the Gospel, which has to do with the representation and elucidation of certain decisive leading points, that it reveals to us for the first time in various ways the pragmatic connection and motive of events (No. 4). But this by no means excludes the possibility that the connection may frequently be destroyed in isolated cases, the historical colouring dimmed; the representation of events, owing to the meaning they have acquired for the narrator, being misplaced.

Nothing indeed is more incorrect than the assertion so confidently made, that the Gospel is wanting in all development and is therefore pervaded by a dull monotony, that everything is prepared from the beginning, so that the catastrophe can only be brought about at last by artificially inserted springs; as the analysis of the Gospel (No. 5) has sufficiently shown.[6] By the question in x. 24 the Gospel attests in the clearest way that the current objection of Jesus here confessing His Messiahship from the first in the face of all, is altogether incorrect. But it is true that the way in which he points out at every stage of development how the matter stands, and sees the end prefigured in the beginning, demands a certain foresight toward an historical estimate of the Gospel. Although the Apostle speaks of faith in the name of Jesus as a matter of course, he himself supplies enough material for distinguishing between its various stages; as also between the different kinds and forms of discipleship, for which he has only the expression *μαθηταί*, and between the different forms of unbelief, which the *Ἰουδαῖοι* are made to represent.[7] All this demands also criticism of his state-

[6] How little the Gospel presents things in accordance with a model is shown by the way in which in the pilgrimage to the feast at Galilee, notwithstanding the apostasy of the people so decisively emphasized in chap. vi., faith in the Messiahship is again and again reawakened, until at the last visit of Jesus to the feast it breaks forth once more; as also by the way in which in the Jerusalem struggles Jesus continually conquers new ground, even in the capital and in hierarchical circles, a success which however was of short duration and had no decisive importance.

[7] It is certain from the way in which John describes the nobleman's attaining to faith in the word of Jesus, the way in which he represents even the multitude as being fed, and in which he depicts Jesus' free

ments, but is so far from making it impossible for them to proceed from an eye-witness that nothing but a completely unpsychological and unhistorical idea of the range of human memory could require the absence of such phenomena, or deny their presence.

§ 52. The Johannine Question.

1. The Johannine Gospel, in common with the Johannine Epistle, belongs to those New Testament writings whose language and views exercised the earliest and the most general effect on the literature of the second century (§ 5, 7). Everywhere we come upon traces of its existence and of an acquaintance with it; it seems to have been most fully turned to account theologically from early times in Gnostic circles (§ 8, 3). But it was powerless by its discourses of Christ, so different in many respects from those of the synoptic Gospels, to supplant or supplement the tradition of the Lord's words fixed by these, especially by the Gospel of Matthew tens of years previously; as we see in the case of Justin whose whole theology was nevertheless greatly influenced by it (§ 7, 3). It was only when the beginning of the reading of the Gospels in the Church and the introduction of heretical Gospel-writings made it necessary to limit the number of those that were ecclesiastically valid, and when this Gospel was everywhere classed with the earlier ones, that its historical value first became matter of reflection (§ 5, 6); although ideas drawn from the synoptics, such as that of the *one* year's ministry of Christ, had nevertheless

surrender of Himself in Gethsemane, that his recollection of the history was modified by the importance which these events had acquired in his view. In this way it may have come about, that the miracles of foresight at the marriage in Cana and at the feeding of the multitude were in his eyes transformed into miracles of Divine omnipotence; and that he adopted the later view of the occurrence during the night-crossing, although his account supplies the particulars by which to rectify it. Thus he may even have over-estimated the pragmatic importance of the raising of Lazarus.

long been preserved (comp. Orig., *De Princ.*, 4, 5). But the reason why this Gospel, so peculiar as compared with the earlier ones, and of which so early and so great an abuse was made by the heretics, nevertheless belongs from the beginning as a matter of course to the Gospel-Canon in process of formation, we first learn from Theophilus of Antioch, according to whom it must always have been handed down as Johannine (*Ad Autol.*, 2, 22); for Clement, Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.*, 4, 2) and Irenæus at the end of the second century all attribute it to the Apostle John. The fact that Marcion did not adopt it into his Canon, on the ground of his repudiation of primitive Apostolic authority (§ 8, 6), can only prove that it was handed down as primitive-Apostolic, for otherwise he might easily have arranged or interpreted it in his own sense; while the fact that the later Alogi of Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 51; comp. Philastrius, *Hær.*, 60) taking their stand solely on internal evidence drawn where the Gospel was concerned from its differences with the earlier ones, denied the Gospel and the Apocalypse to the Apostle John and ascribed them to Cerinthus, with whom even Polycarp represents the Apostle as having lived (§ 33, 2), only proves that even they could have entertained no doubt as to the Gospel having originated towards the end of the Apostolic period.[1] With more exact information as to its origin, we are very scantily supplied. All that Clement of Alexandria knows from the old tradition of the Presbyters is that John wrote last, to which opinion all who follow adhere, and

[1] It is matter of dispute whether it is this or another party of which Irenæus says (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 11, 9) that they "illam speciem non admittunt, quæ est secundum Joannis evangelium;" but in every case even this probably antimontanistic (as Baur, Lücke, Ritschl and Mangold have shown in opposition to Volkmar, Scholten and Harnack) party have nothing against it except that in it "Paracletum se missurum dominus promisit;" and it is quite improbable that the party ever had any importance in the Church, owing to the very incidental mention made of them by Irenæus, who does not think it worth his while to defend the Gospel against them.

only gives the current impression as to the peculiarity of his Gospel when he says that John *συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον* (ap. Euseb., *H. E.*, 6, 14). Irenæus transfers the Gospel to the sojourn at Ephesus (*Adv. Hær.*, III. 1, 1 : *ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων*). The decision of later critics respecting the time of its composition is without value for us, because it is bound up more or less with a false idea of the exile of the Apostle in Patmos (§ 33, 5; comp. Epiph., *Hær.*, 51, 12). Its very relation to the Johannine Epistle obliges us to put the composition of the Gospel in the nineties (§ 42, 5, 7). The later we bring it down, the easier it is to understand the Apostle's estrangement from his Jewish past, and the different character of the book as compared with the Apocalypse.[2]

2. Opposition to the genuineness of the Gospel originated with the English deists at the end of the seventeenth century, against which Lampe defended it in his *Comm. Exegetico-Analyticus* (Amsterdam, 1724–26). It was not however till the end of the eighteenth century that the opposition was properly shaped by Evanson ("The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists," London, 1792), who ascribed the work to a convert of the Platonic school in the second century, and was immediately attacked by J. Priest-

[2] It was quite a mistake on the part of Semler, Tittmann and even Schleiermacher to attribute earlier composition to the Gospel, in order not to credit the Apostle with too long a memory; and on the part of Lampe, Wegscheider and Lange to put it even before the destruction of Jerusalem, in favour of which appeal was made to v. 2. It is likewise too early to go back to the year 80 (comp. Meyer, L. Schulze) or to the eighties (comp. Ewald and Keil). The definite account of the Muratorian Canon as to the motive of its composition, viz. that John wrote at the instigation of his fellow-disciples and of the bishops more especially of Andrew, and with their consent, is echoed in Clement and again in Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, 9 : "rogatus ab Asiæ episcopis)"; but this is unquestionably only an idea taken from xxi. 24 and from the mention of Andrew in the introduction of the Gospel in i. 41.

ley and David Simpson. In Germany the question was first raised by Eckermann (in his *Theol. Beiträge*, V. 2, 1796), who thought the Gospel should be traced back merely to Johannine notes. He was opposed by Storr and Süsskind in *Flatt's Magazin* (1796). The frivolous attack of an anonymous writer excited a somewhat livelier discussion in the beginning of the present century, terminating only in a universal conviction of the unshaken genuineness of the Gospel.[1] The question was lifted to a higher stage of scientific examination by Bretschneider's epoch-making work, *Probabilia de Evang. et Epistol. Joannis Apost. indole et origine*, Lips., 1820). In this volume the contradictions between the fourth and older Gospels were set forth in detail, the unsatisfactoriness of external testimony attempted to be proved, and the difficulty of bringing the entire character of the Gospel into consistence with the historical picture of John the Apostle, prominently set forth. In all modern criticism of the Gospel there has hardly been one important suspicion advanced against its genuineness that was not here discussed. This criticism soon called forth a deluge of counter writings proceeding from all theological sides,[2] so that Bretschneider himself declared his object to induce

[1] The anonymous work entitled, *Der Evangelist Johannes und seine Ausleger vor dem jüngsten Gericht*, 1801, the author of which was soon discovered to be Superintendent Vogel, maintained that the Gospel written by a Jewish Christian, was based upon a Johannine treatise largely wrought over and interpolated; while Horst (in Henke's *Museum*, 1804) thought it was composed from sources of different kinds by an Alexandrian. The genuineness of the Gospel was subsequently attacked by Cludius (*Uransichten des Christenthums*, 1808) and Ballenstedt (*Philo und Johannes*, 1812). But rationalism itself steadfastly adhered to the genuineness. Comp. Wegscheider, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in das Evangelium Johannes*, Götting., 1806); Tittmann, *Meletemata Sacra*, Lips., 1816, and the Introductions of Eichhorn, Hug, and Bertholdt. Ammon, however, in a programme of 1811 proposed to separate the editor from the author of the Gospel; and Paulus (*Heidelb. Jahrb.*, 1821) traced it back to a disciple of John.

[2] Comp. Stein, *Authentia Evy. Jo.*, Brandenb., 1822; Hemsen, *Die*

a better confirmation of the Johannine origin to have been attained (comp. Tzschirner, *Magazin für christlichen Predigten*, II. 2, 1824). De Wette alone never got over the doubts raised by Bretschneider; though he never reached so far as to entirely reject the Gospel's genuineness (in his Introduction since 1826). In favour of its apostolicity appeared the commentaries of Tholuck (after 1827) and Klee (1829), Guericke's *Beiträge* (1828), Hase's *Leben Jesu* (1829), the Introductions of Schott and Feilmoser (1830), and finally a specially apologetic work by Hauff (*Die Authent. und der hohe Werth des Evangeliums Johannes*, Nürnberg, 1831). Through Schleiermacher the Gospel again became the special favourite of modern theology; and out of love for it the synoptics had to suffer much unreasonable neglect, while the Apocalypse was decidedly rejected.[3]

3. The Johannine question properly dates from the appear-

Authentie der Schriften des Evang. Joh., Schlesw., 1823. Usteri, *Comm. critic., in qua Evg. Jo. genuinum esse ostenditur*, Zür., 1823; Calmberg, *De Antiq. Patr. pro Evg. Jo. αὐθεντίᾳ test.*, Hamb., 1823. Olshausen, *Die Echtheit der vier kan. Evang.*, Königsb., 1823. Crome, *Probabilia haud probabilia*, Leyd., 1824; besides the *Komm.* of Lücke (1820) and of Kuinöl (3 Aufl., 1825).

[3] The controversies originating in the *Leben Jesu* of Strauss (1835) in which the credibility of the Gospel history was chiefly attacked and John's Gospel only indirectly, besides all the literature that followed were external to the proper Johannine criticism. Strauss himself (3rd ed., 1838) was perplexed for a moment regarding his doubts about the fourth Gospel through the reply of Neander (in his *Leben Jesu*, 1837); even Gfrörer came to acknowledge the Gospel's genuineness in spite of his negative position with respect to the Gospel history (*Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1838); and Weisse tried to preserve a genuine nucleus at least in the Johannine discourses (*Evangel. Geschichte*, 1838). But Strauss took back in the fourth edition (1840) all his admissions; Bruno Bauer (*Krit. d. ev. Gesch. d. Joh.*, 1840) went beyond him in his negations; and Lützelberger (*Die kirchl. Trad. über den Apostel Johannes*, 1840) rejected all the Johannine writings as well as the entire tradition of the Apostle's Ephesian abode. Comp. on the other side the Introductions of Credner and Neudecker (1836, 40) Frommann (*Echtheit und Integr. des Evangelium Johannes, Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840) and Ebrard (*Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*, 1842).

ance of the Tübingen school, though it only sharpened and deepened the arguments advanced against the Gospel by Bretschneider. But the treatment it received was not the statement of a number of weighty doubts against it; the genuineness of the work is *à priori* inconceivable from the standpoint of the school's conception of the history of the Apostolic age, which stands or falls with the denial of the Gospel's Apostolic origin. The Apostle John, one of the Judaistically narrow primitive Apostles irreconcilably at variance with Paul, the author of the strongly Judaistic and anti-Pauline Apocalypse, cannot possibly have been the writer of a Gospel which was interpreted not only in a spiritual method throughout, after the example of Schleiermacher's school, but as anti-Jewish and antilegal. The way that Baur took to establish his conception of the work was entirely new. By an acute analysis of the Gospel, which first opened up in various ways a knowledge of its composition, he endeavoured to prove its thoroughly unhistorical character, and to show that it is a purely ideal composition making no pretence to the character of a historical work. The Evangelist dealing freely with the synoptical traditions, giving them a *tendency* character and supplementing them with new, independent doctrinal fictions, intended solely to develop and work out dialectically the fundamental ideas of his Logos-doctrine in all its particulars, clothing it in the dress of a history of Jesus. But he also tried to make the origin and history of the Gospel intelligible. It intervened between the opposing elements by which the second century was agitated, resolving them into a higher unity; and soon gained the approval of all parties. Arising out of the Gnostic current of the time, it came in contact with Montanism through its doctrine of the Paraclete; in the Easter controversy it appeared on the side of the Roman custom, and by representing Christ as the true Passover Lamb slain on the 14th Nisan furnished the means of finally severing the

Church from the observances of Jewish worship. The view of a literary fraud is decidedly rejected. The person of the Apocalyptist, to whose work the Evangelist largely links his spiritualizing treatment of the Gospel, is made much more significant as the bearer of a new conception of Christ's person by which the Gentile-Christian author in a truly Apostolic spirit elevates Christianity into a universal religion. His work is the crown of all mediating attempts by which the antagonism of the Apostolic age was overcome in the second century, and the founding of a Catholic Church brought within practical limits.

In attacking John's Gospel, Baur's disciples preceded him. Schwegler had already attempted to show in his work on *Montanismus und die Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, 1841, how the Gospel proposed to reconcile the antagonisms of Montanism (Ebionitism) and Gnosticism with ecclesiastical unity and to pave the way for the Western observance of the Passover (comp. also *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1842, 1, 2); and Köstlin had investigated its doctrinal system on the presupposition of its spuriousness (*Der Lehrbegriff des Evangel. und der Briefe Johannis*, Berlin, 1843; comp. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, 2). The epoch-making essays of Baur upon the Gospel of John appeared in the *Theol. Jahrb.* of 1844, and were completed in his *Kritischen Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, 1847 (comp. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1848, 2). Zeller endeavoured with the aid of sharp criticism to prove that the external testimonies on behalf of the Gospel are insufficient (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1845, 4; comp. also 1847, 53, 58). Hilgenfeld, who pronounced Baur's exegetical analysis unsatisfactory, wished to show in the Gospel in a doctrinal-historical way a transition from the Valentinian to the Marcionite Gnosis (*Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis*, Halle, 1849; comp. *Die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung und geschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1854, and *Einleitung*, 1875); while Volkmar thought that the anti-Jewish dualistic Gnosis of Marcion was presented in it as superseded by the Logos doctrine of Justin, which gave a check to Monism about 150–160 (*Religion Jesu*, 1857; *Geschichtstreue Theologie*, 1858). According to their conception of the Gospel the Tübingen school had to date it in or after the middle of the second century; but Hilgenfeld went gradually back again into the thirties.

4. The appearance of the Tübingen school called forth fresh zeal in defending the Johannine Gospel. Thus Merz immediately stepped forth in the *Studien der evange-*

lischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs (1844, 2) and Hauff in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1844, 46) against Baur and Zeller. Thiersch attacked the entire fundamental standpoint of the school (*Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Kritik der NTlichen Schriften*, 1845); and Ebrard (*das Evangelium Johannes und die neueste Hypothese Baur's*, Zürich, 1845) directed against it his rough polemic which he continued in later editions of his *Wiss. Kritik* (1850, 68; comp. his revision of Olshausen's Comm., 1861). The most important and most thoughtful work proceeded from Bleek in his *Beiträge zur Evangelienkritik* (Berlin, 1846; comp. his *Einleitung*, 1862). Weitzel, in his book on the Christian Passover (1848), endeavoured to overthrow the arguments taken from the history of the Passover controversy against the Gospel, which course was followed by Steitz after 1856 (comp. § 51, 3); who defended against Baur in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1849, the testimony of the Evangelist himself. After 1851 Ewald appeared on behalf of the Gospel in his *Jahrbüchern für biblische Wissenschaft* (comp. the *Johanneischen Schriften*, Gött., 1861). In the year 1852 Meyer published the first fresh revision of his commentary on John, in which he entered most carefully into the criticism of the Tübingen school. B. Brückner elaborated the commentary of de Wette in a method decidedly apologetic (1852, 5. Aufl., 1863), and Luthardt (*das Johanneische Evangelium*, Nürnberg, 1852, 2. Aufl., 1875) united with a recognition of the Gospel's apostolicity and credibility a conception of its composition in accordance with ideal points of view based in many ways upon Baur. In the same year appeared the Catholic Introductions of Adalb. Maier and Reithmayr, and the Dutch Niermayer tried to prove in a prize essay of the Hague Society (*Over de Echthied der Johanneischen Schriften*) the agreement of the Apostolic composition of the Apocalypse with the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, for which Hase also appeared in his *Sendschreiben an Baur* (*die*

Tübinger Schule, Leipz., 1855) The external evidences on behalf of the Gospel were examined by Ewald in his *Jahrbücher*, 1853, and by Schneider (*Die Echtheit des Johanneischen Evangeliums*, Berlin, 1854). In the same year appeared K. Mayer's *Die Echtheit des Evangeliums Johannes*, Schaffhausen, 1854, as well as the new edition of Guericke's Introduction.

Apologists afterwards entered with great zeal into the subject of external evidence, having been stirred up to it by Tischendorf's *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* Leipz., 1865, a work which appeared in a fourth edition in 1866. Riggenbach wrote against Volkmar's *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, Zurich, 1866, in his *Die Zeugnisse für das Evangelium Johannes neu Untersucht*, Basel, 1866; and against Scholten (*Die ältesten Zeugnisse in Betreff der Schriften des N.T.'s, deutsch von Manchot*, Bremen, 1867) appeared Hofstede de Groot (*Basilides als erster Zeuge für das Alter der NTlichen Schriften, insbesondere des Johannes*, Leipz., 1868). It cannot be denied that the Apologists obtained very decided success in this subject. The publication of the *Philosophumena* (ed. Miller, 1841), the discovery of the conclusion of the Clementines (Dressel, 1853), and finally the Commentary of Ephraem Syrus on *Tatian's Diatessaron* (§ 7, 6) refuted assertions of the Tübingen school that had been long and obstinately held. It was driven back step by step from its positions professedly supported by the late origin of the fourth Gospel. Hilgenfeld admitted that Polycrates and Apollinaris were acquainted with it; it had to be conceded that Justin knew it (§ 7, 3); and its effect, as far as the Apostolic Fathers were concerned, was admitted to go back earlier and earlier, particularly after Keim. But the importance of these successes has perhaps been much overestimated by apologists.

Since the middle of the last fifty years the zeal of apologists has slackened, and particular questions have been more discussed. In the first years of 1860 appeared the commentaries of Hengstenberg (1861), Lange (2. Aufl., 1862), Bäumlein (1863), Godet (1864), which were in favour of the genuineness; which were followed in more recent times by Keil (1881), Schanz (1885), and Wichelhaus (*Akad. Vorles.*, 3, 1884). The best summaries of apologetic results were given by Luthardt (*Der joh. Ursprung des vierten Evang.*,

Leipz., 1874) and Beyschlag (*Zur joh. Frage*, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1874, 5; also printed separately; Halle, 1876; comp. *Leben Jesu*, Halle, 1885, 86).

5. Notwithstanding a number of important treatises by apologists, the attack on the genuineness of the fourth Gospel has merely reached that result of the Tübingen school which has obtained most approval beyond the circle of its proper supporters. Apologists have been at fault in directing their polemic almost entirely against the original form of Baur's criticism of the Gospel, which presents many transparent weak points. Strauss in his *Leben Jesu* (1864) had already stripped Baur's analysis of its modern philosophical character, and followed out the tendency-elaboration of synoptical material into the finest details (comp. also Scholten, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes, deutsch von Lang*, 1867). Keim (1867) was able to establish this still more effectively because he thought he had got a well-attested picture of the history from the synoptics, which supplied a sure rule for the rejection of all presumed remodellings and transformations in the fourth Gospel. It is clear that all who set out from the same historical view, such as Hausrath, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Wittichen and others must of course adopt his position toward John's Gospel. It should be added that Keim had already abandoned the obvious error of attributing the work to a Gentile Christian, and acknowledged the attestation of it to such an extent as to carry up its origin to the second decade of the second century; though he afterwards brought it later down by a decade. It is true that he was compelled by such means to take the desperate step of disputing the entire tradition which makes John live and labour till the end of the century at Ephesus, and at the same time his authorship of the Apocalypse, so that he returned to the hypercriticism of Lützelberger (No. 2; note 3); a position against which the true adherents of the Tübingen school have energetically

protested (comp. § 33, 2; note 1). All the more favour did this view meet with among the representatives of the modern critical school.[1] Even beyond the circle of those who decided to go along with Keim and others in this path, the opposition to the Gospel's genuineness found approval, such as that pronounced by Mangold in his revision of Bleek's Introduction (1875, 86); for though it is consciously reserved, it is beyond doubt favourable to it in result. Thoma (*Die Genesis des Johannesevangeliums*, Berlin, 1882) has recently endeavoured by means of a strict analysis of the whole Gospel, investigating the sources and occasions of every individual thing, to attribute it to a Jewish Christian of Alexandrian culture in Ephesus (the presbyter of the second and third Johannine Epistles), subsequently perhaps to the war of Barkochba (comp. against this Völter in the *Theol. Studien aus Würtemberg*, 1). Jacobsen (*Untersuchungen über das Johannesevangelium*, Berlin, 1884) tries to establish the spuriousness of the Gospel by the application of means entirely new, while pointing out its general dependence on Luke's Gospel.

6. Mediating hypotheses were put forward as might have been naturally expected. Eckermann and Vogel had already admitted a kind of Johannine basis for the Gospel (comp. also Rettig, who supposed that a disciple of John introduced his Logos philosophy into the Apostle's notes; see *Ephem.*

[1] Wittichen thought for a long time that even on this supposition he could defend the genuineness of the Gospel as a doctrinal work directed against Essene Ebionism, between 70 and 80 in Syria (*Der geschichtliche Charakter des Evangeliums Johannes*, Elberfeld, 1869; comp. against it Pfleiderer, *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1869, 4); but he himself abandoned this view which reminds us of the oddities of the anonymous Saxon (*Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihr Verfasser*, etc., 1845). Schenkel, who supposed that the Gospel had its origin in the Ephesian circle (*Charakterbild Jesu*, 1864), in order to secure the historical character of some Johannine traditions in it, passed over entirely in the fourth edition to the opinion of Keim, whose denial of the Ephesian John even Holtzmann in his Introduction opposes with much acuteness.

exeget., 1824); Ammon separates the editor from the author; and Paulus, the disciple of John as author from the eye-witness (No. 2, note 1). Weisse, who held the Epistle of John to be genuine, looked for the authentic basis of the Gospel in a series of Johannine studies, in which the Apostle meant to set forth the doctrine of his master more connectedly (*Evang. Gesch.*, 1838; comp. on the other side Frommann, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 4); adhering as he did to his opinion not only after the appearance of the Tübingen school (*Die Evangelienfrage*, 1856), but also finding a follower in Freytag (*Die heil. Schriften des N.T.'s*, Potsd., 1861; *Symphonie der Evang.*, 1862).[1] Reuss followed a course directly the reverse in abandoning from the first the discourses as a development of the Johannine theology; admitting the possibility at least of an Apostolic authorship. Renan, who in the 13th edition of his "Life of Jesus" (1897) adduced against the entire Tübingen criticism the irrefutable argument that parts of the work contained too much firm historical rock to be dissolved into purely ideal formations, and openly said that the way in which the Gospel gives itself out as Johannine is no pseudonymous bookmaking but downright fraud, gave up the speeches, but assumed that the Gospel itself had its origin and basis in Johannine dictations. Ewald, in spite of his energetic opposition to the Tübingen school, thought that the friend who put the addition to the end of the Gospel had some share in moulding the present form of the work which the Apostle dictated; and Thenius (*Das Evangelium der Evangelien*, Leipz., 1865) assigned at least some explanatory additions to the words of Jesus, with

[1] As Schenkel tried to separate the genuine pieces (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1840, 4); so Schweizer attempted, after extracting the Galilean parts which he ascribes to the author of the 21st chapter, to save the remainder as a description of the extra-Galilean ministry of Jesus (comp. also Krüger-Velthusen, *Das Leben Jesu*, 1872); but both subsequently retracted their opinion.

the designation of John as the beloved disciple, to the hand that worked up the whole. Michel Nicolas (*Études Critiques sur la Bible*, 1864) thought that John the Presbyter the disciple of the Apostle, was the author; and Tobler, who at first assigned the Gospel to Apollos a disciple of the Apostle, basing his work on the communications he received from the Master (*Die Evangelienfrage*, which appeared anonymously at Zürich, 1858, comp. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1860, 2), afterwards assumed a genuine Aramaic foundation which he even attempted entirely to restore (*Das Evang. Joh. nach dem Grundtext.*, Schaffh., 1867). The most conspicuous attempt toward a mediating hypothesis was made by Weizsäcker, who after giving a series of instructive investigations in detail (*Jahrb. f. d. Theol.*, 1857, 59, 62), published his *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1864) in which he assigned it to a disciple of John who based his work upon Apostolic traditions but betrays his discipleship partly by using the synoptical accounts of speeches, partly by mixing up things that took place with the Apostolic impression they made. This hypothesis has obtained much weight by the fact that Hase, who for a long time defended the Gospel against the Tübingen school, finally embraced it in his *History of Jesus*, Leipzig, 1876). But although it certainly solves many difficulties of the Johannine question, it is irretrievably shattered by the testimony of the Evangelist himself (§ 51, 1) which cannot be reconciled with it except by assuming manifest falsehood.[2]

[2] Wendt after hints thrown out by Ritschl (comp. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1875, 3) has finally returned to Weisse's mediating hypothesis (*Die Lehre Jesu*, Gött., 1886). Following the analogous way in which the logia are worked up in the first Gospel, he has attempted to definitely separate a series of Johannine logia belonging to the later time of Jesus's ministry which were provided with brief historical notices and introduced by the prologue, and to show their revision by the fourth Evangelist whose credibility as an historian he gives up in the main. Such remodelling

7. The solution of the Johannine problem must begin at the point where Baur instituted his criticisms. It may be possible to perceive many departures of the fourth Gospel from the older ones, and to apprehend many features peculiar to it and much of the material as ideal, explaining them by new points of view from which the author set out. But it contains a fulness of detail of every kind, of supplements to the synoptic tradition, of direct contradictions to it and even of intended corrections of it, which the ingenuity of criticism can never trace to the author's ideal views, but on the contrary present difficulty of union with them. And it is unquestionable, that the author, who only made the reception of his work difficult through these departures from the tradition that prevailed in the Church, was limited by definite recollections or traditions which would no longer have existed in the 2nd century. Besides, all assumption of ideal inventions is inconsistent with the weight which the Gospel lays upon the actuality of what it narrates, as Beyschlag in particular has convincingly proved; and it can be well shown that the speeches of Christ in the Gospel are absolutely unintelligible as mere expositions of the theology of logos-philosophers. But criticism has not succeeded in fixing the date of the Gospel viewed as a pseudonymous production. Apart from the fact that it is much unsettled respecting this point, the post-Apostolic time of the second century presents no person, nor even any definite tendency of thought from which a work of such spiritual significance as criticism itself allows the Gospel to be, could have emanated. The work cannot be

of the logia he explains by the views of his circle and his time, renouncing all idea of fabrication or falsification. But this dividing hypothesis cannot escape the objection of being made according to preconceived premisses, and is neither able to defend against criticism that which is admittedly Apostolic, nor to justify against apologetics the rejection of what is separated as a later addition.

either the cause or the product of a reconciliation of contending opposites in the second century, since such reconciliation did not take place; on the contrary, the struggle between ecclesiastical consciousness and gnosis only became sharper after Judaism had been overcome. And yet both parties frequently appealed to this very Gospel with like zeal; the gnostics first, so that the Church had every reason for disavowing a pseudonymous production so suspicious. The greatest riddle is always the pseudonymity itself. It is inconceivable that the unknown could connect his writing directly with the Apocalypse which, according to the conception of its relation to the Gospel set forth by criticism itself, and in spite of all that has been said about a certain affinity of the two works, is still thoroughly adverse to the Gospel. So also is the way inconceivable in which the writer claims for himself identity with the Apostle John, though this is only indirectly or slightly intimated; a procedure opposed to that of all pseudonymous writing; as is the fact that he directly vouches for his own ocular testimony, which can only be pronounced a plain deception. On the other hand, the Johannine question is not solved so long as nothing but the hypothesis of spuriousness is proved untenable. By the process of criticism the difference between the Gospel and the synoptics, and the impossibility of sacrificing at once to that latest product of the Apostolic age the older tradition absolutely attested in its credibility, has been set forth with an acuteness and lucidity which necessitates an explanation of such difference.[1] But such explanation is only possible if it be conceded that this Gospel presents Apostolic

[1] To sacrifice the Apocalypse to the Gospel, after the early attestation and internal proof of its Apostolicity appears to be a highly dangerous proceeding; and therefore the question as to the Apostolic origin of both must be again taken up. In doing so, stress must be laid on viewing the theology of the fourth Gospel in its Old Testament foundation and its mysticism as purely religious; not as the product of a philosophy of the time, which would be to mistake its specific character.

reminiscences according to ideal points of view and a reproduction of Christ's historical discourses combined with Johannine elucidation and explanation. Though it is usual to concede this much in principle (comp. even Luthardt and Brückner, particularly Grau and Beyschlag) yet little has been done as yet to point out thoroughly both in detail (comp. Weiss 6. Aufl. of Meyer's *Handbuch to the Gospel of John*, and *Leben Jesu*, 2 Aufl., 1884). It is only by such proof that the conception of the Gospel as a work containing purely ideal creations without a basis of historical reminiscences can be decidedly surmounted. The solution of the Johannine question lies in an impartial criticism of the Gospel conducted on these lines.

APPENDIX.

HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT.

Though the history of the text does not certainly belong to the department of Introduction to the New Testament (§ 4, 4 note 3) but to Hermeneutics, yet for the sake of those who are accustomed to look for it in a work like the present, I must not entirely omit the subject. The following account makes no pretension to an independent investigation or scientific advancement of textual history; whatever is necessary to be known by those who proceed to the study of the New Testament is put together in a summary way.

I. The Preservation of the Text.

Comp. Montfaucon, *Palæographia Græca*, 1708. Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur Griech. Paläographie*. 2 Aufl., 1875. *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*. 2 Aufl., 1875. Gardthausen, *Griech. Paläographie*, 1879.

1. The autographs of the New Testament authors were certainly lost at an early date. They were mostly written on Egyptian paper (χάρτης 2 John 12) made of the bark-like coverings of the papyrus (βίβλος), with a reed-pen (κάλαμος 3 John 13), and black ink (μέλαν 2 Cor. iii. 3). In consequence of the slight durability of such material it was soon worn out; and as the writings had not for the most part the intrinsic value which would have belonged to them had they proceeded from the hands of the Apostles themselves (§ 16, 3), they were early replaced by clean copies. As early as the fourth century parchment supplanted this frail material (μεμβράνα 2 Tim. v. 13), so that Eusebius was charged with the duty of having fifty Bible MSS. made of it for use in Constantinople (§ xi. 4); and but small fragments of New Testament papyrus MSS. are now preserved. The roll form disappeared with the papyrus (comp. Luke iv. 17; Rev. vi. 14), and the book form came into vogue with sheets of four double-leaves (quaterniones) usually put together in a τεῦχος (volume); with the writing in three or four columns (σελίδες, τρισσά, τετρασσά) till the continuous mode appeared. The costliness of this material, which led to the fatal washing of old parchments and their use for new writing (palimpsests, codd. rescripti), at last compelled men to seek for a substitute; and that was found in cotton paper which

came into use in the West from the eighth century and onwards. It was not however till the thirteenth century that its use became general; soon after which time it was succeeded by linen paper. Our present pens came into use after the sixth or seventh centuries.

2. The writing consisted of uncials, that is of stiff, square-shaped, unconnected letters, without division into words or clauses (scriptio continua), without accents, breathings and iota subscribed, the last appearing occasionally as a post-scribed letter (ΤΩΙ). But few traces of marking leading paragraphs, of a free interpunction and aspiration signs are found in the oldest MSS. It was not till the ninth century that uncial writing gradually merged into the cursive, and this became prevalent in the tenth, uncials being confined to copies particularly handsome. Accents as well as iota subscript came into general use along with cursive writing after the eighth century; after a gradual and increasing accentuation. It is true that the present accentuation is attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium (200 B.C.), who is also said to have introduced aspirates; but both were used at first only in the schools of the grammarians. In the fifth century the Alexandrian deacon Euthalius furnished his edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles with accents, such as already existed in several ancient MSS. In order to facilitate the reading of the text in these books Euthalius divided it as he had done before that of the Pauline Epistles into *στίχοι*, *i.e.* lines, containing just as many words as could be conveniently uttered in a breath; and such stichometrical way of writing was afterwards applied to the Gospels and came into common use even beyond Egypt.[1] As the putting of these lines made MSS. more bulky and costly, the beginning and end of them received some kind of marks, creating a sort of interpunction. Yet the beginnings of this method take very different forms along with stichometry, especially the usage of the Greek grammarians according to Dionysius the Thracian (comp. Isidore of Spain, *Origen*, i. 19). It was not till the ninth century after which a division into words prevailed, that such interpunction became general though differing greatly, till it attained its more settled form from Aldus and Paulus Manutius, after the invention of printing.

3. When Clement of Alexandria speaks of *περικοπαί*, Tertullian and Dionysius of Alexandria of capitula (*κεφάλαια*), it is doubtful whether they were merely fanciful divisions made by the reader for a right un-

[1] The same is found as early as the fourth century in Greek and Latin classics (*στιχηδὸν* or *στιχηρῶς γράφειν*, *βίβλοι στιχηρεῖς*, *στιχομετρία*). Origen arranged the poetical books of the Old Testament *κατὰ στίχους*, and Jerome adopted it in his translation. Euthalius gives an account of his procedure, in Zacagni, *Collectanea Monum. Vet. Eccl.*, Rom., 1698, i. p. 403 ff. The length of the stichs varied greatly among different transcribers and in different writings. The account of the number of stichs at the end of the books (comp. the stichometry of the Cod. Clarom., § 11, 1) continued long after the stichometrical mode of writing had been given up.

derstanding of the contents; or sections, which each copyist marked as he pleased. Greater currency was obtained by the division of the Gospels into sections, which Eusebius numbered in the Gospel-harmony of Ammonius of Alexandria (3rd century) for the easier finding of parallel sections. By his ten canons he thus characterised the passages found in one Gospel, in two, three or in all four. Besides these 1162 κεφάλαια (Matt. 355, Mark 234, Luke 342, John 231) later MSS. have the more comprehensive τίτλοι (for the most part with an announcement of the contents: titulum), that are almost like the present chapters (according to Suidas Matthew 68, Mark 48, Luke 83, John only 18). Euthalius found in the Pauline Epistles an ἔκθεσις τῶν κεφαλαίων (148 altogether) which he took into his stichometrical edition, and completed by a like division of the Acts into 40 and of the Catholic Epistles into 31. Andrew of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who lived at the end of the fifth century, divided the Apocalypse into 24 λόγοι and 72 κεφάλαια. The present distribution into chapters comes from Hugo a Sancto Caro in the 13th century, who is said to have introduced it into his Latin postils on account of his projected concordance. As early as the 13th century theologians began to quote according to it; and it was transferred from the Vulgate into the Greek text in the first printed editions.[2] Robert Stephens the printer made the present division into verses, putting it into his edition of 1551. The superscriptions and subscriptions of the individual books in the New Testament, originally short, gradually lengthening and containing all sorts of notices relating to time and place are all of later date, as appears from their own statements even where these are apparently incorrect (§ 1, 1).

4. The purity of the original text was vitiated from the first by copies which could easily be disfigured by every kind of careless and arbitrary procedure, in the absence of all official control, since careful adherence to the letter was completely unknown at that time. On the other hand, the mode of citation in old time was so careless in respect to the words (§ 5, 6), and the means of giving the intended sense to the written word so easily applied, that every inducement to intentionally alter the text was wanting. Heretical tendencies departing from the traditional Apostolic doctrine were the first to feel the need of grounding their foreign doctrines upon the writings that were handed down, by

---

[2] From these must be distinguished ecclesiastical reading sections (περικοπαί). Euthalius divided the Acts and Epistles into 57 ἀναγνώσεις in his stichometrical edition. Collections of ecclesiastical pieces for reading (lectionaria, ἐκλογάδια), of Gospel pericopes (εὐαγγελιαρια or -λιστάρια) and of pericopes from the Acts and Epistles (πραξαπόστολοι) are found in the West after the fifth century; in the East not before the seventh or eighth. Comp. Ranke *Ueber den Ursprung unseres heutigen Perikopensystem*, Berlin, 1847. In MSS. their extent is often marked by α (ἀρχή) and τ (τέλος). A list of the reading sections according to the words at their beginning and end is called Capitulare (συναξάριον) or, when designed for holy days μηνολόγιον.

text-changes (§ 8, 4. Comp. Euseb., *H. E.*, on the passages there cited). But many textual falsifications discussed between heretics and catholics were harmless variations, each party preferring those that suited it (comp. Matt. xi. 27 ; John i. 10) ; and real falsifications of the text could no longer succeed in opposition to the jealous watchfulness of the Church. It was not until a much later period, when firmly formulated ecclesiastical dogma was no longer in harmony with the freer expressions of the New Testament, that doctrinal alterations were really attempted ; and they could be removed easily enough from the original text, because the latter was preserved in so many MSS. But along with this complaints were made about the differences in the *ἀντίγραφα* already noticed by Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres.*, v. 30, 1), which Origen refers partly to the carelessness of transcribers, partly to the audacity of improvers (*in Matth.*, tom. 15, 14). He himself however did not refrain from such procedure, as is shown by his introduction of the Gergesenes (Matt. viii. 29) and of Bethabara (John i. 28) into the text. The MSS. made or revised by him as well as by his successors Pierius and Pamphilus, were particularly valued (comp. Jerome on Matt. xxiv. 36, *De Vir. Ill.*, 75, Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 32); but that he undertook a formal critical recension of the New Testament as of the Septuagint text he himself expressly denies (*on Matth.*, tom. 15, 14). Something of this nature certainly appears to have been done by the Egyptian bishop Hesychius and the Alexandrian presbyter Lucian (3rd century, see Jerome, *Ep. ad Damasum*, *De Vir. Ill.*, 77, comp. *Decret. Gel.*, 6, 14, and besides § 12, 4) ; but we know nothing of the method and results of their endeavours, which were at all events entirely rejected in the West. On the other hand, the traces of various correcting hands in our MSS. show that the latter were often compared with others and corrected by them, so that though many errors caused by carelessness were removed, only secondary readings were usually introduced. How many of our MSS. rest upon such corrected copies is shown by the mixed readings and half alterations which they contain. It was not until the seventh and eighth centuries when Constantinople became the chief seat of transcribers that a more equable and correct, but much emended text was restored to the younger MSS.

5. The commonest mistakes are the omission of letters, syllables, words and clauses in cases where the like or same followed, and the eye of the copyist wandered from the one to the other (by homoioteleuton). The instances in which letters or syllables were doubled are much less frequent. Many letter sin the square character like one another were readily interchanged. In dictating, consonants of like sound were very often exchanged ; while vowels and diphthongs similarly pronounced chiefly in consequence of itacism were also confounded. The expression was often involuntarily conformed in words to the context ; even to senselessness in the endings of words. It is hard to say how far the interchange of synonymous expressions, pronouns, and of simple and compound words is owing to sheer carelessness. Many transpositions arose merely from the fact that a word was omitted by mistake ; and

since the omission was soon observed it was rectified by the first transcriber putting the word in a later place, or, after the corrector had marked the error, the word was introduced into a wrong place by a later copyist. Abbreviations also were sometimes read incorrectly, original glosses erroneously put into the text, a word altered or supplied after New Testament parallels or (in citation) after the LXX. either unconsciously or on the presupposition of the text's being necessarily wrong because it does not agree with the parallels passing through the mind of the copyist. The older are the sources of the text the more numerous are the mistakes in them which have arisen solely from the negligence and haste of transcribers, or from the more or less arbitrary alterations of words and want of care in reproducing letters.

6. The text has suffered much greater injury from intentional emendations, which always advance towards the formation of one that is essentially uniform. In this respect there is naturally a superabundance of additions consisting of subject and object, copula and verb, genitives (especially pronouns) and adjectives (or pronouns), of articles and appositions, of conjunctions, adverbs and prepositional additions even amounting to glosses of all kinds which serve the purpose of elucidation. Synonyms and pronouns, simple and compound words (especially verbs), conjunctions and prepositions, tenses, moods and conjugations, cases and persons, word-forms and flexions are here exchanged with one another; sometimes to make the expression more correct or to beautify it, sometimes to make it more emphatic or more conformable to the context. To this head belong the majority of word-transpositions, serving the purpose of emphasis or elucidation. Occasionally real difficulties are removed, at other times there is an intentional conforming to parallels especially in the Gospels, respecting which Jerome complains in the Epistle to Damasus. Many emendations are meant to facilitate the sense or to obviate the misunderstanding of it; they also express the exegetical mind of the transcribers; but on the whole we must not attribute too much exegetical reflection to emendators. Above all, no consistency should be looked for in these emendations, especially as they have passed over into later copies but partially, or have been partially corrected again by means of an older text. The fact that emendations continued to increase for a length of time in spite of the growing reverence for the letter was probably owing to the perception of the circumstance that the difference of texts which had been observed from the first helped the meaning, so that the original which had been lost through the carelessness of transcribers could be restored by their means.

7. The quotations of the Fathers appear to be the surest evidences of the text as it was read at a definite time and in a definite place. These begin in fact with the time of Irenæus,[3] whose chief work however has

[3] We learn from the history of the Canon that the words of the Lord were much used at first, but for the most part very freely without ad-

been preserved only in a fragmentary way in Greek, so that at the turn of the second and third centuries Clement of Alexandria is the only writer applicable to the present purpose. Origen is of more importance for the third century, especially on account of his exegetical works, though they are preserved only in part, and in a pretty free translation. In the fourth and especially the fifth century there are besides Chrysostom, Athanasius, Epiphanius and Eusebius, together with the interpreters Theodoret and Theodore of Mopsuestia, of whose commentaries nothing but fragments are preserved in catenæ and some in a Latin translation. Cyril of Alexandria may also be mentioned, and the commentary of Andreas of Crete, specially useful for the Apocalypse. In the West the learned Jerome alone occupied himself with the Greek text; while the Latin Fathers, as well as the translators of Irenæus and Origen are available only for the text of the Old Latin version. Of special importance are Tertullian and Cyprian in the third century; in the fourth Augustine and Pelagius; Ambrose and the so-called Ambrosiaster (Hilary the deacon), Victorin and Rufinus, Hilary of Poitou and Lucifer of Cagliari; in the fifth century Fulgentius, Sedulius, Vigilius; and in the sixth the commentary of Primasius on the Apocalypse. These citations, however, present nothing but very fragmentary material; and the necessary critical preparatory works are still wanting in which they might be collected and appraised.[4]

---

hering to the individual Gospels, and generally in the form of mere allusions to the gospel narrative. All that is of any importance for the text of the Gospels prior to Irenæus, whether in ecclesiastical or heretical circles, is collected by R. Anger, *Synopsis Evangeliorum M. M. L.*, Lips., 1852. The very free reminiscences of passages in the Epistles and Acts cannot prove anything in establishing their text, except some indistinct examples (especially in Polycarp).

[4] The Church Fathers can only be sure witnesses for the form of the text they had, in cases where their exegesis or their doctrinal and polemic exposition is attached to the wording of the New Testament; in other cases it is still doubtful how far they quote from memory or from consultation of the passage. Besides, there is a possibility that their copyists or editors adapted the quotations to the current text before them. It is also to be noted that satisfactory critical editions of the Fathers are still wanting, as well as complete collections of their citations like what has been attempted in a masterly way by Rönsch, *Das Neue Testament Tertullians*, Leipz. 1871 (comp. also his collections relating to the other Latin Fathers in the *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.*, 1867, 69, 71, 75).

II. Manuscripts.

Comp. C. R. Gregory's *Prolegomena to Tischendorf's Eighth Edition*, Leipzig, 1884, 1.

1. We possess between sixty and seventy uncial MSS.; and nearly two-thirds of them contain more or less extensive fragments, about twenty-five, single parts of the New Testament or the whole. On the other hand there are upwards of 1,000 cursive MSS. apart from Lectionaries, for the Gospels alone above 600, for the Pauline Epistles above 300; but as they are not older than the end of the ninth century, and contain with few exceptions the later adjusted text, they are of less value. The age of the codices can be determined in almost every case by indirect means alone; by the state of the MS. (i. 1), or the manner of writing (i. 2), and the divisions that appear in it; for even if a remark is found upon the MS. as to date or other particulars, it may have originally been due to the copyist and been adopted from him along with the MS. itself. But the age of a MS. does not determine the value of its text; since even a proportionately late MS. may have much older contents. As it is certain that only separate parts of the New Testament were transcribed at an early date, a MS. that embraces at the present day the entire book may be referred in its various portions to contents bearing a different character and value, as is apparently the case with respect to the Cod. Alex. It is often very difficult to distinguish the hands of different correctors (lectio a prima, a secunda manu, etc.). The codices bilingues (Græcolatini, Græcocoptici) have the translation in a particular column, in the margin, or between the lines (versio interlinearis). The suspicion raised by R. Simon, Michaelis and especially by Wetstein that the Greek text in the Greek-Latin MSS. has been altered from the Latin is now universally abandoned. The so-called mixed codd. (opp. puri) are furnished with scholia or a commentary. The present mode of marking the uncial MSS. with large Latin letters, the cursive with Arabic letters, has this inconvenience that the same letter frequently denotes different MSS. in different parts of the New Testament; and particularly in the case of the cursives different parts of the same MS. have a different cipher; an arrangment which is chiefly owing to Wetstein.

2. Only four uncials belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries, probably made in Egypt (Alexandria) contain the whole of the New Testament in addition to the Old, or embraced so much at first. The most valuable of them is the Vatican (B) in the Vatican library (No. 1209). Unfortunately it is defective from Hebrews ix. 14 to the end, so that the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon and the Apocalypse are wanting.[1]

[1] Formerly there were only incomplete and unreliable collations of it; and the edition superintended by Cardinal Mai (Rome, 1858) proved thoroughly unsatisfactory. Tischendorf's edition (Leipzig, 1867) was derived from an examination too narrowly circumscribed by the authorities; but it gives in conjunction with the splendid facsimile edited by

To the fourth century also belongs the *Codex Sinaiticus* (ℵ) discovered by Tischendorf in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. It has the advantage of embracing all the New Testament without a gap; and was published by the discoverer in a splendid edition (Petersburg, 1862), as also in minor editions (Leipzig, 1863, 1865).[2] To the fifth century belongs the Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum, which wants, however, the greater part of Matthew and Second Corinthians, while in John's Gospel there is a gap of two chapters. The two epistles of Clement are at the end of the MS. It was published in fac-simile by Woide in 1786, edited again by Cowper; and in 1879 issued by the curators of the Museum in a splendid fac-simile edition. The Codex Ephraem Syri or Regio-Parisiensis (C) belonging to the library of Paris, a rescript, is about the age of the Alexandrian; but it is so defective as to contain only five-eighths of the New Testament, and has not been deciphered for the most part till recently.[3]

3. The Gospels were earliest and oftenest copied. Upwards of twenty complete or at least extensive portions of them are contained in uncial MSS. Besides the codd. mentioned in No. 2 there is the sixth century and Western stichometrically written Greek-Latin Cod. Bezæ or Cantabrigiensis (D), containing the Gospels and Acts, having however important gaps (ed. Th. Kipling, Cambr., 1793; Scrivener, London, 1867). In addition to it there are the Codex Regius (L) in the national library of Paris, No. 62, a MS. which is often in contact with the oldest text, and belonging to the eighth century (ed. Tischendorf in the *Monumenta sacra inedita*, Leipz., 1846); and the Cod. Sangallensis (Δ) a Greek-Latin MS. with an interlinear version in the library of St. Gall. and of the ninth century (ed. Rettig, Zurich, 1836), both containing the four Gospels though not without gaps. Numerous fragments of all four

---

Vercellone and Cozza (Band V. 1868) a satisfactory knowledge of its text. Editions *ad fidem Cod. Vat.* were published by Kuenen and Cobet (Leyden, 1860) and by Phil. Buttmann (Berlin, 1862).

[2] The parts of the Old Testament discovered in 1844 were published at Leipzig as the Cod. Friderico-Augustanus, in 1846. Besides the Old and New Testaments the Cod. Sinait. contains the Epistle of Barnabas and part of the Shepherd of Hermas. Comp. Tischendorf, *Notitia edit. Cod. bibl. Sinait.*, Lips. 1860. *Die Sinaibibel*, Leipz. 1871. As to the value of the MS. comp. K. Wieseler *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1861, 64, Hilgenfeld, who puts it into the sixth century, in his *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1864, 1, and against him Tischendorf in the same journal 1864, 2. Comp. also Phil. Buttmann in the same, 1864, 66, Scrivener, *A Full Collation of the Cod. Sin.*, London, 1864, 67. The MS. is in Petersburg.

[3] In this palimpsest the entire writing was washed off in the twelfth century, and the parchment furnished anew with the Greek text of ascetic writings belonging to the Syrian Ephraem. At the end of the seventeenth century, the old, effaced characters were discovered and brought out again after the Giobertine tincture had been applied, 1834, 35. The text was actually deciphered by Tischendorf, and that of the New Testament edited in facsimile, Leipzig, 1843,

Gospels are also in the Cod. Guelpherbytanus (P) of the sixth century (ed. Tisch., *Monum. nova coll.*, 1869), and Codex Monacensis (X) belonging to the beginning of the tenth century. Important fragments of Matthew are contained in the Cod. Dublinensis rescriptus (Z) of the sixth century (ed. J. Barrett, Dublin, 1801; T. K. Abbott, Lond., 1880). Fragments of Luke are in the Cod. Nitriensis (R) a palimpsest of the sixth century (ed. Tisch., *Monum. nova coll.*, 1857) and the Cod. Zacynthius (Ξ), a palimpsest of the seventh or eighth century (ed. Tregelles, 1861). Fragments of Luke and John are in the Cod. Borgianus (T) of the fifth century (ed. Georgi, 1789) and the Cod. Guelpherbytanus II. (Q) about the same age (ed. Tisch., *Monum. nova coll.*, 1860). All other uncials from the Cod. Basileensis (E) of the four Gospels (eighth century) contain on the whole nothing but the later emended text. Here too belongs the Cod. Rossanensis (Σ) of the sixth century lately discovered by O. v. Gebhardt and A. Harnack, who edited it in 1883.

4. Next to the Gospels the Pauline Epistles were most frequently transcribed. Besides the uncials mentioned in No. 2 there is the Codex Claromontanus (D) belonging to the sixth century, and now in the Paris library No. 107, written stichometrically in Greek and Latin, and belonging to the West (ed. Tisch., Leipz., 1852); of which the Cod. Sangermanensis (E) is a late copy not without gaps, the original text being mixed up with corrections. Valuable fragments of the Pauline Epistles are also contained in the Cod. Coislinianus (H) of the sixth century. It is probable that one and the same original MS. is reproduced in the Cod. Augiensis (F) which Scrivener edited at Cambridge (1859), and the Cod. Boernerianus (G) now in Dresden, edited by Matthæi (Meissen, 1791, 1818); both belonging to the ninth century. Of the same date are the Cod. Mosquensis (K) which contains the Catholic Epistles also; the Cod. Passionei now Angelicus (L), which has also the Acts; the Cod. Porphyrianus (P) having the Apocalypse besides (ed. Tisch., *Monum. nova coll.*, 1865, 1869) and the Cod. Uffenbachianus or Ruber (M) having valuable fragments of the Epistles to the Corinthians and Hebrews (ed. Tisch., in the *Anecd. sacr. et prof.*, Leipzig, 1855, 1861).

5. For the Acts we have in addition to those mentioned in No. 2 the Cod. Cantabr. (D, comp. No. 3) and the Codd. L P (comp. No. 4) besides the Cod. Laudianus (E) in Oxford, a stichometrical Greek-Latin MS. belonging to the sixth or seventh century (ed. Th. Hearne, Oxford, 1715; Tisch., *Monum. nova coll.*, 1870) and the Cod. Mutinensis (H) of the ninth century. For the Catholic Epistles there are only those mentioned under No. 2 and 4 (K L P). For the Apocalypse there is in place of the Cod. Vaticanus here defective a MS. also in the Vatican library (No. 2066) belonging to the eighth century (B), published by Tischendorf in the *Monum.* (Leipzig, 1846, comp. also the *Appendix Novi Testamenti Vatic.*, 1869) which is inferior in value to Cod. P (No. 4).

III. Versions.

What are given here are only such as serve for sources of the text and therefore those taken directly from the Greek. Being considerably older than the oldest MSS. they may be of the greatest importance so far as the words of the original can be safely ascertained from them. But the MSS. of them which are extant vary as well as the Greek codd., and lie under the suspicion of having been altered after the current Greek text. Critical editions are also wanting.

1. In Syria there appeared soon after Tatian's Diatessaron (§ 7, 6) "The Gospel of the Separated," *i.e.* a Syriac version of the four Gospels complete. This was published as preserved in extensive fragments by Cureton: *Remains of a Very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac*, London, 1858 (in Tisch. Syr ^{cur}). The MS. was found among the monasteries of the Nitrian desert, and belongs to the fifth century (comp. F. Bäthgen, *Evangelienfragmente. Der Griechische Text des curetonschen Syrers*, Leipz., 1885). More recent probably is the Peshito, *i.e.* simple, faithful, a verbal but not slavishly literal translation representing the limited canon of the Syrian Church at the beginning of the third century (§ 10, 1). It was published at Vienna in 1555, afterwards by Leusden and Schaaf (Leyden, 2nd ed. 1717, in Tisch. Syr ^{sch}), lastly by Lee (London, 1823) and W. Greenfield (London, 1828); but it still awaits critical elaboration. In the year 508 the Monophysite bishop Philoxenus had a new translation made by his rural bishop Polycarp, which slavishly adheres to the Greek text even to the extent of being ungrammatical. But it is preserved only in a revision by Thomas of Charkel in the year 616, who compared it with later Greek MSS. and furnished it with critical signs after the manner of Origen (ed. J. White, Oxford 1778–1803, comp. in Tisch. Syr ^{p}, and the Gospel of John according to it, published by Bernstein, Leipzig, 1853).[1]

2. Their nearness to the oldest text makes the Egyptian versions almost more valuable than the Syriac ones. The former seem to have originated in the third century, since monks who knew and used the

---

[1] The Charklensian translation contains the four Catholic Epistles wanting in the Peshito, but not the Apocalypse. The relation which these bear to the four Epistles published by E. Pococke (Leyden, 1630) and usually taken into editions of the Peshito is matter of dispute. Formerly it was believed but wrongly that the original text of the Philoxenian was preserved in them, just as it was supposed that the Apocalypse published by Lud. de Dieu (Leyden, 1727) and taken into editions of the Peshito was the work of Thomas of Charkel. Comp. Bernstein, *De Charklensi N. T. transl. Syriaca*, Breslau, 1837. 2 Ausg. 1854. Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syrorum literariæ*, Monast., 1871. There is an Evangelisterium which Adler discovered in the Vatican library written in a sort of Aramæan dialect, and said to have been made from the Greek in the fifth century, published by Count F. Minischalchi Erizzo as an Evangelium Hierosolymitanum (1861–64), marked by Tisch. as Syr ^{hr}.

Bible were acquainted only with the language of the people. Of the oldest Upper Egyptian translation in the Thebaic or Sahidic dialect (in Tisch. Sah.) nothing but fragments have been published as yet. These were collected and published by W. Ford (Appendix to Woide's edition of the Cod. Alex., 1799), by Zoega (1810), Engelbreth (1811) and by O. v. Lemm (*Bruchst. d. sahid. Bibeluebersetzung*, Leipz., 1885). On the other hand, the somewhat younger version in the dialect of Lower Egypt (Memphitic) usually called the Coptic (in Tisch. cop.) was published by Wilkins (Oxf., 1716), by Schwartze (*Die Evangelien*, Leipz., 1846, 1847) and by P. Boetticher (*Acts and Epistles*, Halle, 1852). There is nothing but unimportant fragments of a version in the Basmuric dialect, the knowledge of which we also owe to Zoega and Engelbreth (see above). Christianity came to Ethiopa in the fourth century, and even then a translation of the Bible seems to have been made in the prevailing Geez language. That which has been preserved (in Tisch. Æth.), followed various Greek MSS. whose readings were occasionally mixed. It was edited at Rome in 1548; but a more exact Latin translation than this edition was made by Bode (Brunswick 1753). A new edition prepared for the Bible Society of London by Th. Pell Platt (London, 1826, 1830) makes no pretence to a critical character.

3. The Goths in the fourth century received through their bishop Ulfilas a translation of the Bible from the Greek (comp. G. Waitz, *Leben und Lehre des Ulfilas*, Hannover, 1840). The Gospels are preserved in the Cod. Argenteus at Upsala, a MS. of the fifth or sixth century, celebrated both for its beauty and its singular fortunes. Since 1665 it has been repeatedly edited, last of all by Uppström (Upsala, 1854, 1857). Fragments of the Epistle to the Romans were edited by Knittel from a Wolfenbüttel palimpsest (Braunschweig, 1762), considerable fragments of the Pauline Epistles by Count Castiglione from palimpsests found by Mai in the Ambrosian library at Milan (Mail., 1829, 1830). The whole was edited by Gabelentz and Loebe (Leipz., 1836–1846; comp. in Tisch. go), and lastly by Bernhardt (1884; comp. also Bernhardt, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die gothische Bibel*, Meissen, 1861; Elberfeld, 1868; *Vulfila, oder die gothische Bibel*, 1875). The history of the Armenian version is well known through the Armenian history of Moses of Chorene. It was made from the Greek in the first half of the fifth century, not without having been influenced from the first by the Peshito which the Armenians had used before. It has also been conjectured that it has been influenced in the MSS. and even the editions of it, by the Vulgate (ed. Uscanus, Amsterd., 1666; Zohrab., Venedig, 1789, 1805; comp. in Tisch., arm).[2]

[2] Of still less value for the criticism of the text are existing Arabic versions (in Tisch., ar., arr.) because they were usually made from the Syriac and Coptic, when Islam overspread western Asia and Africa and suppressed the languages of the people there (comp. the Arabs Erpenius, Leyden, 1616, published from a Leyden MS. of the New Testament by

4. Still earlier than in Syria the need of a Latin translation was felt in the West, naturally not in Rome and scarcely in Italy, but in the provinces where Christianity had earliest taken root, as in Africa, where Tertullian speaks of the translation of a Greek expression "quæ in usum exiit" (*De Monog.*, 11). The agreement of his quotations with those in the Latin text of Irenæus shows that there must have been a tolerably wide-spread translation even at the end of the second century. But it unquestionably belongs in its origin to a time when the Gospels alone were read in churches and the need of a version in the language of the country was felt. The apostolic writings were translated gradually, according as they came into general use; so that one translator for the whole is out of the question. Jerome knew only an "antiqua translatio, vulgata editio" (comp. Cassiodor., *Institut. Divin.*, lit. 14, vetus translatio) the MSS. of which he found in such confusion that each one appeared to be a peculiar form of the text (*Præf. ad Damasum; tot exemplaria, quot codices*), a fact which he imputes to the carelessness of transcribers, but above all to the temerity of emendators, whom he calls "vitiosi interpretes, imperiti translatores," because they improved the version mainly by the original text. When Augustin speaks of the "infinita varietas latinorum interpretum" (*De Doctr. Christ.*, 2, 11; "nullo modo numerari possunt"), his language favours the idea that he refers to emendators rather that to translators of the entire N. T; but he considered the MSS. which had become by such means characteristically different

---

Thomas Erpe). Yet there must have been an older translation of the Gospels derived directly from the Greek and underlying more or less various later versions (Storr, *De Evv. Arabicis*, Tüb., 1775; Gildemeister, *De Evang. in Arab. Transl.*, Bonn, 1865). It was edited at Rome in 1590, and again by Lagarde from a Vienna MS. (Leipz., 1864). But it is very questionable whether it belongs to a time prior to Mohammed. In like manner, the Arabic versions of the N. T. in the Polyglotts made directly from the Greek (comp. also the editions published by the Roman Propaganda, 1671, and the London Bible Society, 1827) are of very uncertain origin, and have been altered in part in the editions after the Vulgate or the original Greek. Other Oriental translations are wholly worthless. The Georgian (Grusinian) did not exist before the end of the sixth century; whether it was made direct from the original is doubtful; and it was revised in the edition of Moscow (1743, 1816) from the Slavic-Russian Bible. This Slavic translation, said to proceed from the two apostles of the Slavs, Cyril and Methodius, in the ninth century (in Tisch., sl) was made indeed from the Greek, but was influenced from the first by the Vulgate, since according to the papal decree of 880 the Gospel was always to be read in Latin first, and then in Slavonic. It has been examined by Dobrowsky (Slovanka, 2 Lfg., Prag., 1815) and by Muralt, (1848). The Gospels were printed as early as 1512 in Wallachia, the entire N. T. at Wilna, 1623; at Moscow, 1663, 1751. A Persian translation of the Gospels made from the Greek was edited by Wheloc and Pierson (Lond., 1652–57), but it belongs to the fourteenth century (in Tisch., pers^{whe}). The Gospels in the Polyglotts (in Tisch. pers.^{p}) have been translated from the Peshito.

in different districts (comp. *Retract.*, I. 21, 3; *Codices Afri, contra Faust.*, 11, 2: "codd. aliarum regionum") as so many different versions; among which he prefers the *Itala* (*i.e.* the one that originated in Italy, *De Doctr. Christiana*, 2, 15). This appellation is the traditional designation of all memorials of the old Latin translation now extant, whether they really go back to a common root or to different translators).[3] These memorials, even apart from the patristic citations which are doubly precarious in the present case (ii. 7) are very numerous especially in the Gospels, furnishing by their excessive literality very safe references to the text which is at their basis, and going back as high at least as our Greek copies. They are marked with small Latin letters in the critical apparatus.[4]

---

[3] This question cannot be decided either by the above statements of the Church Fathers, or by the extant remains of the old Latin translation, since the separate parts of the writing refer back in any case to different translators, since different translators could hardly have worked quite independently of one another, and since a version revised throughout according to the original text differs from one made in dependence upon an older, by a fluctuating line. The majority of modern textual critics abide by one common basis (comp. also Eichhorn). Michaelis supposes several translators, as do de Wette, Hug, Reuss, especially Zeigler (*Die lateinischen Bibel Uebersetzungen vor Hieronymus*, München, 1879). The question too whether the language of the extant fragments of the old Latin translations points to an African or an Italian origin is still doubtful. Comp. on this subject Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, Marb. u. Leipz., 2 Aufl., 1875, and his comprehensive studies of the Itala in the *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1868, 83.

[4] John Martianay published at Paris in 1695 after the Cod. Corbejensis (ff[1]) the Gospel of Matthew and James's Epistle. In 1735 (ed. Aucta, Paris, 1749, 51) Sabatier published in his *Bibl. s. Lat. Vers. Antiq.*, in vol. iii. the Gospels after the Cod. Colbertinus (c) of the eleventh century. In 1749 Jos. Blanchini, in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, published at Rome, the Gospels after the Cod. Vercellensis (*a*) of the fourth century (which Irici had already edited at Milan, 1748), the Cod. Veronensis (*b*) of the fifth century, and the Cod. Brixianus (f) of the sixth. The Cod. Palatinus (e) of the fifth century was published by Tischendorf (*Evang. Palat.*, Leipz., 1847); and the same scholar also published important fragments of the Cod. Bobbiensis (k) of the fifth century in the *Vienna Jahrbücher*, 1847, 48. Mark and Luke were published by Alter, and recently by Belsheim (Leipz., 1885) after the Cod. Vindobonensis (*i*) of the sixth century. The Cod. Rhedigeranus (l) of the seventh century was published by Haase at Breslau (1865, 66). Comp. the old Latin Bible texts now appearing at Oxford. In addition to these, besides numerous fragments, there are the Latin translations in the Codd. Græco-Latini (comp. ii.), always denoted by small letters corresponding to the large ones of the Greek text, which extend to the Epistles also. The Itala fragments of the Pauline and Petrine Epistles have been recently published by L. Ziegler (Marburg, 1876). Comp. too the fragments of the Roman Epistle published by Knittel (Braunschweig, 1762), and of the Roman and Galatian Epistles by Rönsch (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1879). The Acts and Apocrypha were edited by Belsheim from the *Gigas Librorum*, Münst., 1879. The Anglo-Saxon, which was made from the

5. In order to rectify the great confusion arising out of such differences among the codd., Jerome, urged by the Roman bishop Damasus, undertook a revision of the old Latin translation. It was not without suspicions of the offence which his work would excite and with the greatest caution that he altered only where the sense was expressly wrong, and solely by Greek MSS. conformed in their general character to the old Latin transtion. Even in cases where he preferred another reading in his commentaries, his revision was often allowed to remain in the old text. He began his work with the Gospels (383 A.D.), and has given an account of his procedure in the preface addressed to Damasus. Without doubt he extended it to the whole of the N. T. (comp. *De Vir. Ill.*, 135).[5] Nor was he wrong in foreseeing that the undertaking would bring upon him the reproach of a sacrilegium. In the fifth century, Leo the Great still used nothing but the old Latin version. On the other hand Cassiodorus declared in favour of the new one; and by the authority of Gregory the Great who used both indiscriminately but with a preference for Jerome's, it acquired more and more recognition, till it became in reality the *Vulgata*, *i.e.* the universally received version, after the eighth century. Scarcely however had the Vulgate attained to general currency when the MSS. of it had already fallen into confusion not merely by the fate naturally attending all manuscript tradition, but by the readily occurring admixture of its text with that of the old Latin. Hence endeavours to improve the text of the Vulgate from old MSS. date from the time of Cassiodorus. Charlemagne commissioned Alcuin to make such a revision. But all these attempts only increased the confusion, until after the thirteenth century some proposed to themselves at least the task of emending the MS. text, putting in the margin nothing but various readings and critical remarks. This was done in the *Correctoria Biblica* (Corr. of Sens, conducted by the theological faculty of Paris, 1230) in which the different orders of monks zealously laboured. After the middle of the fifteenth century begin printed editions (the first dated at Mainz, 1462) of which there were upwards of 200 till 1517; but they only present a late, mixed, and irregular text.[6]

---

old Latin in the eighth century is also a source for the knowledge of it (ed. M. Parker, Lond., 1751; Benj. Thorpe, Lond., 1842).

[5] Comp. G. Riegler, *Krit. Gesch. der Vulg.*, Sulz., 1820; Leander van Ess, *Pragm. krit. Gesch. der Vulg.*, Tüb., 1824; Kaulen, *Gesch. der Vulg.*, Mainz, 1868. The publishers of Jerome, Martianay (1692), Vallarsi and Maffei (1734) were the chief persons who laboured to restore the text. Of MSS. of the Vulgate, we have, of the sixth century, the Cod. Amiatinus (am.), the high age of which has been recently denied by Langen and Lagarde, probably wrongly (ed. Tischendorf, Leipz., 1850, 54), the Cod. Fuldentis (fu) put by Lachmann and Buttmann at the basis of their editions (ed. Ranke, Marburg, 1868), and the Cod. Forojuliensis (for.) of the eighth century, with the Cod. Tolctanus (tol.). Comp. the Proll. to Corssen. *Epistula ad Gal. ad Fid. opt. Cod. Vulg.*, Berlin, 1885.

[6] The first critical edition is that in the Complutensian Polyglott (1517, comp. iv. 1). The chief Protestants who busied themselves with

IV. The Printed Text and Text-Criticism.

Comp. Reuss, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Græci.* Brunsv., 1872.

1. The Vulgate had been printed for half a century; there were now printed German and Hebrew Bibles, when some specimens of the New Testament in Greek first proceeded from the press of Aldus, in Venice, because the study of Greek was so backward. But after 1503 the Spanish cardinal, Franz Ximenes of Cisneros, archbishop of Toledo, laboured to produce an edition of the Greek Testament for his Polyglott. It was completed in 1514; but "the Bible of Alcala (Complutum)" could not be published till 1522 after the papal permission had been obtained. Meanwhile the bookseller Frobenius, in Basel, had got Erasmus to prepare an edition of the Greek Testament, which appeared with his own translation at Basel, 1576, so that it attained precedence over the Complutensian Polyglott as the *editio princeps.* Both editions were derived from late MSS., and were therefore relatively alike; besides, that of Erasmus was very hastily made, as Fr. Delitzsch (*Handschriftliche Funde*, Leipz., 1861, 1862) has pointed out by the way in which a Reuchlin MS. of the Apocalypse was used. In the Polyglott the Greek is printed without accents and spirits; it has become very rare, but was reprinted by Gratz, *N. T. Græco-Lat.* Tübing., 1821, 27, 51.

2. Erasmus himself prepared four other editions of his text. Luther translated from the second (1519); the fourth and fifth (1527, 1535) were altered according to the Complutensian Polyglott; yet it was repeated till 1705 in some thirty editions. That of Simon Colinæus, at Paris, 1534, presents a mixed text taken from these two editions. More important service was rendered to the history of the text by the Paris printer, Robert Stephens, and his learned son Henry. In the first two editions of the former (edd. mirificæ, 1546, 1549), he follows in the main the Complutensian; in the splendidly printed third (ed. regia, 1550), he attaches himself chiefly to the fifth of Erasmus. Theodore Beza made this text the foundation of the numerous editions he superintended (1565–1598), using the various readings collected by H. Stephens in those issued after 1582. Stephens had collated the two MSS. Codd. D. But

---

the text of the Vulgate were Andreas Osiander (1522) and Robert Stephens (after 1523), whose best edition appeared at Paris, 1540. After the Council of Trent declared the Vulgate to be the authentic Bible text (Session iv. decret. 2 of April 8, 1546), the papal see was obliged to provide for an authentic edition of it. But that proclaimed as such by the Bull *Æternus ille* (Sixtina, 1590) was withdrawn immediately after the Pope's death, and a new one completed by Clement VIII. (Clementina, 1592, 3, 98). Comp. Thomas James, *Bellum Papale s. Concordia Discors Sixti et Clem.*, Lond., 1606; Heinr. v. Bukentop, *Lux de Luce*, Col. Agr., 1710; and for the history of the Clementine, Ungarelli in the Proll. of Vercellone, *Var. Lect. Vulg.*, Rome, 1860, who also published a critical edition of the papal Vulgate. Manual editions by Leander van Ess (1822) and Fleck (1840).

the various readings were used only in part, since Beza ventured upon a more searching improvement of the text only in his translations and annotations. While his text had great repute in the Reformed Church, the brothers Elzevir at Leyden followed the improvements made in it in their edition of Stephens's text (1624). The second edition (1633) calls itself in the preface "textus nunc ab omnibus receptus;" and though that text was so far from corresponding to the fact that Reuss counts up 188 other editions differing from it, yet, through the efforts of these booksellers, the correctness and portableness of their editions, of which five containing about 8,000 copies were issued, the text differing but little from that of Stephens became in fact the *textus receptus* (ς in Tisch. and where it departs from the ed. regia of Stephens ς^{e}). Imperfect as it is, it obtained an almost sacred authority in the Lutheran Church, which had before adhered to the Erasmian text used by Luther.

3. Collections of various readings began to be made, especially in England, on the basis of the *recepta*. In his London Polyglot (1657) Brian Walton gave the various readings of Cod. A, Cod. D and of many other MSS. John Fell (Oxford, 1675) enlarged the number; and John Mill urged on the continuance of such work, having in his edition (Oxford, 1707, reprinted by L. Küster, Amsterdam, 1710), furnished with comprehensive prolegomena (ed. Salthenius, Königsberg. 1734), increased the variations from MSS., versions and Fathers to the amount of 30,000. His contemporary and friend, the great classical philologist Richard Bentley, intended on such basis to make a critical edition with a text represented by MSS. at least 1,000 years old, such as it was, about the time of Jerome; but only a specimen of it appeared, the last chapter of the Apocalypse (1720). The last scholar who still issued the simple *textus receptus*, because he could not publish an edition except on this condition, was John James Wetstein (Amsterd., 1751, 1752). But in his prolegomena, which had already appeared in 1730 (ed. Semler, with remarks, 1764, 66) he not only increased the critical apparatus, but described, named, examined MSS. and pronounced his opinion of their critical value. The text according to his intentions was published by W. Bowyer (Lond., 1763); but as he held that the Western codd. were corrected from the Latin text and therefore rejected them, while he also supposed that the ancient Oriental codd., agreeing with the Western, had been corrected, his text does not materially depart from the *textus receptus*.

4. Meanwhile Joh. Albr. Bengel had broken through the band of the *recepta* in Germany, following in the wake of some English predecessors, by altering it in his edition of the New Testament (Tüb., 1734, 5th ed., 1796, superintended by his grandson); but only where another edition had led the way (except in the Apocalypse). Undisturbed by the insecurity appearing to attach to the text of the New Testament in view of the ever-increasing collections of various readings, he endeavoured to reach a firm judgment as to the value of the evidences for the text, and discovered that they separated into two families according to their peculiar characteristics, viz. the African represented by Cod. A and the oldest

versions; the Asiatic by the younger MSS.; so that it became possible to classify individual readings according to their real value. His *Apparatus Criticus* was published after his death by Burck, Tüb., 1763; and his ideas having been adopted by Semler were expanded till they took the form of different text-recensions (*Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*, IV., 1765; *Apparatus ad liber. N. T. interpr.*, 1761); and in this shape they formed a basis for the recension-system of the great textual critic John James Griesbach. According to him Bengel's African family (traced back by Semler as the *rec. occid.* to Origen) should be resolved into two recensions, the Western belonging to a time before the Canon was formed, bearing a rougher, more Hebraising linguistic character and showing more exegetical glosses, explanations and paraphrases (Cod. D, in the Gospels, Codd. D, E, F, G, Pauline, the Latin Fathers and versions); and the Alexandrian (occidental), originating in the middle of the second century when the Canon was being formed, and having more regard to purity of language (Cod. B, C, Gospels, A, B, C, Epistles, the Greek Fathers and some versions. From them he separated the Constantinopolitan (Byzantine) recension representing a mixed text originating in the fourth century, which he found in the younger MSS. (for the Gospels also in Cod. A). This corresponded to the Asiatic family of Bengel (traced back by Semler as the Orient. recension to Lucian). In many witnesses he found a mixed text. The different recensions were regarded in his critical procedure each as one witness, setting forth firm principles for weighing their testimony as well as for estimating the internal grounds of readings, according to which the more or less probable might be taken into the text. In this respect he always continued largely dependent on the *recepta*.[1] While v. Matthaei combated in the strongest and most passionate way Griesbach's recension-system (comp. *Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen*, etc., Leipzig, 1804), Eichhorn and Hug tried to give it a stronger historical basis, which remained however purely hypothetical.[2] On the other hand A. Scholz went back to the

[1] In his first edition (Halle, 1774, 75) the first three Gospels were printed synoptically, in which form they were repeatedly reprinted; while the historical books subsequently, in a second edition contained the text of the synoptics separately (Halle, 1777) and afterwards became the first volume of his edition. In his second edition of the New Testament (1796, 1806, comp. vol i. of a third edition edited by D. Schulz, Berlin, 1827), he was able to use the materials that had been accummulated in the mean time. Ch. F. v. Matthäi (*Das N. T.*, Riga, 1782–88, 2nd ed., 1803–7) collated more than 100 Moscow MSS., K. Alter (*Nov. Test.*, Wien, 1786, 7) cited Vienna MSS., Andr. Birch (*Quatuor Evang.*, Kopenh., 1788, and *Variæ Lectiones*, 1798–1801) published the fruits of his critical journey undertaken with Adler and Moldenhauer. Griesbach developed his principles in the *Symbolæ Criticæ* (Halle, 1785, 93) and in his *Commentarius Criticus in Textum N. T.*, Jena, 1798, 1811.

[2] Hug called the Western recension of Griesbach which had certainly no claim to be styled a text recension, the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, as Jerome called the unrevised text of the Seventy in opposition to the Hexapla; and

two text-families of Bengel, arriving in this way again at the *textus receptus*, as Matthaei had done in his; and the same text in the main was afterwards defended by Reiche with the sharpest opposition to Griesbach.[3]

5. Whilst the philologist K. Lachmann adopted the idea of Bentley he abandoned the purpose of restoring the original text, intending nothing more than to present the oldest traditional text of the fourth century although the number of testimonies in his time was too small to justify such an undertaking, and many were still insufficiently collated.[4] It is Constantine Tischendorf's great merit that he devoted himself to the task of enlarging and examining the textual apparatus. In numerous and extensive journeys he made a great number of discoveries among which the Cod. Sinait. is the most prominent, collated MSS. with the greatest care and edited many afresh or for the first time (comp. Codd. B, C, D, Paul, E, Acts, L, P, Q, R, Gospels, e Gosp. am.), besides collecting and revising the patristic quotations. His editions exceeding twenty in number, the first of which appeared in 1841, and gradually reaching the "editio octava critica major" (Leipz., 1869, 72, comp. the prolegomena that appeared after his death written by C. R.

---

thought it became more and more confused till the middle of the third century; referring the Oriental recension to Hesychius and the Byzantine to Lucian, of whose critical labours however we know nothing; and a degenerate form of the text to Origen. Since we know for certain that Origen did not undertake a recension of the N. T. text (i. 4) Eichhorn dropped this and assumed a twofold type of the unrevised text as Asiatic and African as early as the second century; the former revised by Lucian in the third century, the latter by Hesychius; and this naturally led to a somewhat different division of the text authorities on the part of the two scholars.

[3] While Matthaei reverted on the whole to the *recepta* in consequence of his Moscow MSS. (note 1) which generally present a younger emended text, A. Scholz pronounced the Alexandrian form in the text found in the oldest Greek and Latin authorities to have been arbitrarily corrupted, and found the original text most correctly handed down from the autographs of the Apostles, in the Constantinopolitan authorities (comp. *The Proleg to the N. T.*, Leipzig, 1830, 36, and his *Bibl. krit. Reis*, 1823, in which however his communications respecting the MSS. collated by him are said to be very unreliable). Reiche collated chiefly Paris MSS. (Gött., 1847), and appeared in his *Commentarius Criticus* (Gött., 1853–62) a very violent opponent of Griesbach's recension system. It was also modified by F. W. Rinck (*Lucubr. Criticæ*, Basel, 1830) who compared for the most part Venetian manuscripts.

[4] He explained the principles on which he proceeded in the *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1830, 35 (comp. in opposition C. F. A. Fritzsche, *De Conf. Ni. Ti. Crit. quam Lachm.*, ed. Giess, 1841). His manual edition appeared in 1831; a larger one with critical apparatus and the Vulgate under the supervision of Phil. Buttmann jnr., appeared at Berlin, 1842, 50. By Ed. v. Muralt, 1846, 48, and Phil. Buttmann, 1865, 5th ed. 1874, were chiefly based upon the Cod. Vat. In the same way Bornemann published the Acts according to the Cambridge MS., 1848.

Gregory, I., 1884) present a textual apparatus ever increasing in fulness and certainty. The text is always independently constituted after the oldest testimonies, but he has wavered greatly in the principles from which he set out, as is shown by the changes which the text has suffered in the various editions. Beginning with Lachmann's method, he had gradually come nearer again to Griesbach and the *recepta* on the basis of a system allied to Rink's of four textual classes, the Alexandrian (current among the Jewish Christians of the East) and the Latin; the Asiatic (among the native Greeks of Asia Minor and Greece) and the Byzantine text (comp. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1842). These he distinguished without desiring to make out anything about their origin and without finding them always preserved in purity in the textual authorities. Finally he returned again to the fundamental ideas of Lachmann, although his inordinate attachment to the Sinaiticus hindered him from carrying them out exactly, and though he never renounced the desire to restore the original text by a criticism based on internal grounds.[5]

6. England, whence the first impulse came has again applied itself to textual criticism with the greatest zeal. S. P. Tregelles worked since 1844 with industry similar to that of Tischendorf in securing a critical apparatus of the text by means of scientific journeys and reliable collations of MSS. His large edition with an excellently arranged apparatus appeared from 1857–1872; but unfortunately the Sinaitic Cod. and the new editions of the Vatican could not be used till the Epistles. In forming the text he proceeded in the main on the Bentley-Lachmann principles (comp. *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*, London, 1854, and his elaboration of textual criticism in Horne's *Introduction*, London, 1856). Where the oldest codd. disagree, the doubtful readings are given in the margin or in brackets. The prolegomena were added after his death by Hort and Streane, 1879. Besides him, F. H. A. Scrivener (*A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 1862, 3rd ed., 1884) has stood up for the claim of the younger MSS., and meritoriously examined cursives. In 1852 (Cambridge) he published the text of the ed. regia with the variations of the latest critical editions. Scrivener and Palmer have given the results of the Revised Version of the English translation completed in 1881, setting forth very clearly the Greek text at the basis of the revision. The ap-

[5] Even after the labours of Tischendorf much remains to be done in order to make the rich critical apparatus we possess really useful, since it is only by a thorough examination in all details of every individual authority, its peculiarity and its relation to others that a safe judgment can be formed as to its readings. Such examination must be undertaken and carried throughout the separate parts of the N. T., since the two leading points to be here investigated present premises that are different in part. The beginnings of such investigations may be seen in Weiss's Introductions to his Commentaries upon Matthew and Mark (1872, 76), and upon the Galatian Epistle by Wieseler (*Komm.*, 1859) and Zimmer (*Zeitschrift. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1881–1883).

pearance of the edition prepared by B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort from 1853 and subsequently Cambridge and London, 1881, 2nd ed. 81, 82, was of striking importance, since it was accompanied by a second volume in which the history of the text and the principles of their criticism based upon it were unfolded with great clearness.[6]

7. The polyglott Bible published by Stier and Theile as a convenient manual gives the *textus receptus* with the variations of modern critical editions (5th ed., Bielef., 1875). The stereotyped edition issued by Tittmann (Leipz., 1820, 24, 28, 31) afterwards revised by A. Hahn (1840, 61) mainly follows the same text. Bengel's text was printed five times forming a manual edition, from 1734–90. The editions of Knapp (Halle, 1797, 5th edition after his death 1840)[7] and of Schott (Leipz., 1805, 4th ed. after his death, 1839) to which a Latin translation was appended, followed Griesbach's text. The Griesbach-Knapp text was still more adapted to the *recepta* by Vater (Halle, 1824) furnished with a Latin version by Göschen (Leipz., 1832) and has obtained great currency in the stereotyped editions supervised by K. G. W. Theile (Leipz., 1844), which have been prepared since the 11th ed. (1875) by O. v. Gebhardt with improvements furnished by the latest critical editions (14th ed., 1885). Greek-German (1852) and Greek-Latin editions (1854, 62, 80) have also appeared. Tischendorf issued many manual copies of his critical editions, some based upon his ed. iv. of 1849, which first appeared in a stereotyped form in 1850 (Leipz. ap. Tauchnitz, 1850, revised in later editions by O. v. Gebhardt till the 9th, 1884); some based upon his triglott (ed. vi., 1854) as an *editio academica* (Lips., 1855.

---

[6] Here especially the Syriac readings are separated which are said to be based upon two recensions made in 250–350; the text greatly emended by them and mixed was then brought by Chrysostom to Constantinople whence it was widely spread in the majority of our authorities (comp. A Gospels and C in part). Going back to the Western readings, that is those current in the West (comp. the two D D's. G Paul. the old Latin and old Syriac versions, Justin, Irenæus, Eusebius), corresponding to the Western recension of Griesbach and to the Alexandrian which is similar to the Oriental in his classification (comp. A epistles, L gospels, Origen to Cyr. Cop.); the former are older but still show great freedom in explanations and additions; the latter betraying an effort to attain linguistic correctness, are younger. These editors also distinguish a neutral text, which the Vatican has preserved and in part the Sinaitic (having however Western and Alexandrian readings); so that in this excellent edition which still leaves much in doubt through brackets and marginal readings and even states the need of conjecture to rectify the text because of alleged exegetical difficulties, our chiefest codex gets its proper rights, mainly in opposition to Tischendorf.

[7] In the appendix to Knapp's edition there is also found a collection of conjectures, such as was formerly made by Bowyer (1763), afterwards translated and enlarged by Fr. Schulz (1774, 75). After conjectural criticism had been rejected for a long time because of the full apparatus of authorities, it is now once more zealously carried on in Holland (comp. also Westcott and Hort, note 6).

15th ed., 1886); others based upon the ed. viii. (1873, 80), with which may also be compared his synopsis of 1851 (5th ed., 1815). His final text was edited by O. v. Gebhardt with the variations of Treg. and Westc. and Hort; some with the Greek alone (Leipz., 1881, 2nd ed. 84); others with Luther's text revised (1881, 84).

V. The Philological Elaboration of the Text.

Comp. in particular Mangold in *Bleek's Einleit.* 4 ed. § 21-36.

1. The oldest attempt to examine the Greek of the N. Testament set out with the Hebrew language, so that the grammar of the one appears as an addition to the other (Glass, *Philologia Sacra*, Jena, 1623, extended to five volumes after 1636). But this kind of Greek was soon treated independently (C. Wyss, *Dialectologia Sacra*, Tigur, 1650; G. Pasor, *Grammatica Sacra N. T.*, Gröningen, 1655). At that very time a violent dispute had broken out between the Purists, who were zealous, in favour of the classical character of N. T. Greek, to do honour to the Holy Spirit (Seb. Pfochen, *Diatribe de Ling. Græc. N. T. Puritate*, Amsterdam, 1629, 33); their leader after 1640 was Jac. Grosse, and the Hebraists (Joachim Junge, *Sent. de Hellenistis et Hellen. Dial.*, Jena, 1639) who like Th. Gataker and Joh. Vorst, endeavoured to show the influence of Hebrew upon it. The dispute agitated the Reformed Church at first; but it passed over into the Lutheran Church also. The writings on both sides were collected, on the part of the Hebraists by Rhenferd (1702); on the part of the Purists by Hajo v. d. Honert (1703). Intermediates, however, who stood over against the excesses of both were not wanting (Joh. Leusden, *De Dial. N. T.*, Leyden, 1670; Olearius, *De Stilo N. T.*, Coburg, 1672). Towards the end of the century victory inclined to the side of the Hebraists; and about the middle of the eighteenth the Purists were entirely silenced, after having found a zealous and able defender in the Lutheran Sigm. Georgi (1732, 33).

2. The victory of the Hebraists contributed nothing to the investigation of New Testament Greek. Throughout a whole century scholars were satisfied with collecting parallels to N. T. passages bearing a grammatical or lexical character, and with heaping up in uncritical fashion a mass of materials called *Observations*.[1] Hence exegesis was

[1] Many observations of this kind were collected by Lamb. Bos (*Obs. misc.*, Franecker, 1707; *Exercitationes phil.*, 2 Aufl., ibid, 1713), Wetstein in his N. T. (1751, 2); Palairet, *Obs. phil. crit*, Leyden, 1752, *Specimenexerc. phil. crit.*, London, 1755) and Kypke (*Obs. sacr.*, Breslau, 1755). But these were also confined to single writers. Observations out of Xenophon, Polybius, Arrian, Herodotus, were collected by G. Raphel (*Annot.*, Leyden, 1747), out of Lucian and Dion. of Halicarn. by Lange (Lüb., 1732), out of Diodorus by Munthe (Leipzig, 1755), out of Thucydides by Bauer (*Comp. Philol. Thucyd.-Paul.*, Halle, 1773), from Josephus by Otte (*Spicil.*, Leyd., 1741), and Krebs (*Observ.*, Leipz., 1755), from Philo by B. Carpzov. (Helmst., 1750), by Lösner (Leipz., 1777) to which

dominated by a senseless empiricism. Every expression which was thought to present some sort of example was looked upon as possible. Under the name enallage it was considered justifiable to take every tense, case, particle for every other respectively; and even the comparative for the positive, the definite for the indefinite article. By assuming ellipses, parentheses, etc. every connection of words was destroyed. By the adoption of Hebraisms, it was even thought possible to explain or excuse the impossible (comp. Storr, *Observ. ad Anal. et Synt. Hebr.*, 1799). This monstrous maltreatment of N. T. Greek which Haab (*Hebräisch-Griechische Grammatik*, Tüb., 1815) made into a sort of system was first abolished from the standpoint of a rational philology by Georg. Bened. Winer in his *Grammatik des NTlichen Sprachidioms* (Leipz., 1822, 7 Aufl. besorgt von Lünemann, Gött., 1867); following H. Planck (*De Vera Nät. Atque Ind. Orat. Græc. N. T.*, Gött., 1810). The *Grammar of the N. T. Language* by Alexander Buttmann, Berlin, 1859, containing remarks on the Greek grammar of Philipp Buttmann, a knowledge of which is presupposed (19, 20 ed.) is similar in character.[2]

3. New Testament lexicography is essentially based upon the old glossaries of Hesychius in the fifth century (comp. Alberti, *Glossarium Græcum in N. T.*, Leyden, 1735), Suidas of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and Phavorinus of the sixteenth century. G. Ernesti collected out of these the explanations relating to the N. T. (*Glossæ Sacræ*, Leipz., 1785, 86). Compare besides the *Eclogæ* of Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck. Leipz., 1820), Cyril of Alexandria, from whose glossary Matthaei collected glosses on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles (*Glossaria Græca*, Moscow, 1775; lect. Mosq., 1779), and Zonaras of the twelfth century, from whom Sturz gathered and explained *Glossæ Sacræ* (Grimma, 1818, 20). The older lexicons of the N. T. by G. Pasor (Herborn, 1626, 7 Aufl., Leipz., 1774), Stock (Jena, 1725, 5 Aufl., by Fischer, Leipz., 1752), and Chr. Schöttgen (Leipz., 1746, published also by Spohn, 1790) were superseded by Schleusner, *Nova Lex. Græcolat. in N. T.*, Leipz., 1792 (4 Ausg., 1819) which with its incomplete lexical standpoint has still much valuable scientific material. These were followed by Wahl (*Clavis N. T.*, Leipz., 1822, 3 Ausg., 1843) which reverts more to classical usage; and

---

Kühn (Pfort., 1785) made a supplement, and from the Apocrypha by Kuinöl (Leipz., 1794). Comp. also the collections made from later Jewish writings in the *Horæ Hebr. et Talm.* by Lightfoot (ed. Carpzov, 1675) and Schöttgen (Leipz , 1733, 42), a labour which has been resumed by F. Delitzsch (*Zeitschrift f. luth. Theol. und K.*, 1876 ff.), and A. Wünsche (*Neue Beitr. zur Erläuterung d. Evv. aus Talm u. Midr.*, Gött., 1878).

[2] Comp. Gersdorf, *Beiträge zur Sprachcharakteristik d. N. T.'s.* Leipz., 1816; Wilke, *NTliche Rhetorik*, Dresden, 1843, and R. H. A. Lipsius, *Gramm. Untersuchungen ueber die biblische Gräcität* (Leipz., 1863), which unfortunately treat of nothing more than marks of punctuation. For manual use comp. Schirlitz, *Grundzüge der NTlichen Gräcität*, Giessen, 1861.

Bretschneider (*Lex. Manuale*, Leipz., 1824, 3 Ausg , 1840) who inclines to the Hellenistic usage. Unfortunately Winer did not attain to the carrying out of his plan of elaborating a lexicon (*Beiträge zur Verbesserung der NTlichen Lexikographie*, Erl., 1823). On the other hand Wilke's *Clavis N. T.* (Leipz., 1841, 52) was excellently and completely worked over by Wilib. Grimm (Leipz., 1862, 65, 1879). Schirlitz's *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zum N. T.* (Giessen, 1851, 3 Aufl., 1868) serves for a manual.[3]

4. None of the N. T. writers owing to his position in life and the development of his mental condition had any knowledge of the master-productions of Greek literature; and therefore their language cannot be measured by the Atticism of the classics. Besides, the Attic dialect itself after becoming the common tongue of the Hellenes in the Macedonian period and even that of the cultivated universally, had undergone a great change by losing many elegancies, and adopting a number of foreign dialectic peculiarities particularly taken from the Macedonian dialect, which was cognate to the Doric. This κοινή or ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος had formed itself into a written and learned language in a rich and splendid literature and attained to great elegance especially in Alexandria (comp. Sturz, *De Dialecto Maced. et Alexand.*, Leipzig, 1808), still used by Philo and imitated by Josephus; but yet the N. T. writers remained wholly uninfluenced even by this written speech. They employed nothing but the popular current language developed out of the κοινή, in which the dialects once separated had become mixed, the original elegancies had been obliterated, foreign elements had intruded, the senses of words being enlarged, new terms and forms created or borrowed from the language of poetry, and syntactical connexions whose original ground and meaning was forgotten, misused or exaggerated. The Latinisms of the N. T. belong in a great degree to the linguistic character of individual works and rest upon special conditions.

5. It was in this language of the people as it was developed in Alexandria with a provincial colouring that the Seventy had translated the Old Testament; and the original must have had an intrinsic influence over it in constructions, phrases, modifications of the meanings of forms of words (Hebraisms). As the old Hebrew was intelligible only to proper scholars, this version became the exclusive medium at least to the Jews of the diaspora through which they acquired a knowledge of the O. T., and therefore it had a decided influence upon their language, especially upon the mode in which the entire religious world expressed its ideas. In Palestine there was also an Aramæan element in the language, since

[3] For settling the vocabulary and usage of the individual writers the *N. T. Concordance* of Erasm. Schmid (Wittenberg, 1638), edited afresh by K. H. Bruder (Leipz., 1842, 5 ed. 1880) is indispensable. A supplement to it was made by F. Zimmer in his *Concord. suppl.*, Gotha, 1887, in which he arranged the New Testament words according to their endings and derivation.

it was usual to hear the O. T. in the synagogues interpreted in the speech of the country; a fact which is unaffected by the question whether there were Aramæan versions at that time (comp. Böhl, *Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel zur Zeit Jesu*, Wien, 1873). This Hebraising (Aramaising) Greek has been called the Hellenistic since the time of Jos. Scaliger and Joh. Drusius, because the Greek-speaking Jews were termed Hellenists (Acts vi. 1); and though Salmasius opposed the appellation, preferring "stilus idioticus" instead, and de Wette, Thiersch, etc. proposed others, yet it has properly continued in use. The Hebraising character is stamped upon the New Testament writings in very different degrees and ways. Besides, the Christian spirit and the new world of Christian ideas must also have had a moulding influence especially over the expression of conceptions specially religious; and this again appeared in different degrees just as the individual N. T. authors had attained to the cultivation of a special doctrinal style (comp. Zeschwitz, *Profangräcität und biblischer Sprachgeist*, Leipz., 1869; Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch*, Gotha, 4 Aufl., 1886). This element in the linguistic character of the N. T. can only be discerned from itself. On the other hand, the linguistic usage of the Church Fathers (Suicer, *Thesaurus Eccl.*, Amsterdam, 1682) or the explanations of ancient interpreters and scholiasts are misleading because they belong to the ecclesiastical phraseology of their time. Here the philological treatment of N. T. Greek passes over directly into the hermeneutical employment of the text, which lies completely beyond the limits of an Introduction. Everything of importance to such Introduction which can be derived from commentaries has been duly considered in its proper place.

Butler & Tanner, The Selwood Printing Works, Frome, and London.

426826

Bib.Lit
W

Weiss, Bernhard
Manual of introduction to the New Testament; tr. by Davidson. vol.2.

University of Toronto Library

DO NOT REMOVE THE CARD FROM THIS POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 13 04 01 03 002 8